

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1336487



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

ELY LECTURES.

THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Rev. Albert Barnes, D.D., LL.D.

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM. By Rev. James^{*} McCosh, D.D., LL.D.

COMPARATIVE EVIDENCES OF SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. A. P. Peabody, D.D., LL.D.

THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY INDICATED BY ITS HISTORICAL EFFECTS. By Rev. Richard S. Storrs, D.D., LL.D.

PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY. By Professor George S. Morris, Ph.D.

THE MIRACULOUS ELEMENT IN THE GOSPELS. By Professor A. W. Bruce, D.D.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Rev. Lewis F. Stearns, D.D.

ORIENTAL RELIGIONS AND CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. Frank F. Ellinwood, D.D.

THE BIBLE AND ISLAM. By Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D.D.

THE BIBLE AND ISLAM

THE BIBLE AND ISLAM

OR

THE INFLUENCE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS
ON THE RELIGION OF MOHAMMED

BEING

THE ELY LECTURES FOR 1897

BY

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D.

LONDON

JAMES NISBET & CO.

21, BERNERS ST.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Copyright, 1897, by Charles Scribner's Sons
for the United States of America

Printed by
Trow Directory, Printing and Bookbinding Company
New York, U. S. A.

To
THE MEMORY OF
PRESERVED SMITH
AND
LUCY MAYO SMITH

School of Theology
at Claremont

KIEFFER 12 57

A9.266

THE ELY FOUNDATION

THE lectures contained in this volume were delivered to the students of Union Theological Seminary in the spring of the year 1897, as one of the courses established in the Seminary by Mr. Zebulon Stiles Ely, in the following terms :

“The undersigned gives the sum of ten thousand dollars to the Union Theological Seminary of the City of New York to found a lectureship in the same, the title of which shall be The Elias P. Ely Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity.

“The course of lectures given on this Foundation is to comprise any topics serving to establish the proposition that Christianity is a religion from God, or that it is the perfect and final form of religion for man.

“Among the subjects discussed may be : The Nature and Need of a Revelation ; The Character and Influence of Christ and His Apostles ; The Authenticity and Credibility of the Scriptures, Miracles, and Prophecy ; The Diffusion and Benefits of Christianity, and The Philosophy of Religion in its Relations to the Christian System.

“Upon one or more of such subjects a course of ten public lectures shall be given, at least once in two or three years. The appointment of the lecturers is to be by the concurrent action of the Faculty and Directors of said Seminary and the undersigned, and it shall ordinarily be made two years in advance.”

PREFACE

THE importance and the timeliness of the subject treated in these lectures are sufficiently evident. As to the method of treatment, I leave the reader to judge. The references given are sufficient to show how far I have gone to the sources. The citations from the Koran may be thought too extensive. My only defence is that I could not well have left any out; in fact, I have considerably reduced the number contained in the first draft of the lectures.

The Arabic words transcribed are not numerous, and the most of them are already current in English. I have not thought it necessary to make any change in these, nor to attempt an exact transliteration.

I have been favored with the loan of books from the Yale University library, the library of Union Theological Seminary, and the library of the Theological Seminary at Princeton. It gives me pleasure to acknowledge this courtesy in this public manner.

LAKEWOOD, N. J.

CONTENTS

LECTURE	PAGE
I. THE APOSTLE OF ALLAH	1
II. THE COMMON BASIS IN HEATHENISM	38
III. THE KORAN NARRATIVES	60
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF GOD	98
V. THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT	132
VI. REVELATION AND PROPHECY	166
VII. SIN AND SALVATION	199
VIII. THE SERVICE OF GOD	231
IX. THE FUTURE LIFE	266
X. CHURCH AND STATE	290

THE BIBLE AND ISLAM

LECTURE I.

THE APOSTLE OF ALLAH

IN the seventh century of our era Christianity seemed triumphant over its enemies in the Eastern Empire. Paganism was destroyed, the heresies had been overcome, the faith had received its full definition in what was supposed to be the final creed. The bishops and monks, at least, might be justified in supposing that the kingdom of God was already established. In the reign of Heraclius the political situation was almost as promising as the ecclesiastical. For that monarch, with almost Roman energy, repulsed the Persians, the hereditary foes of Byzantium, and extended the bounds of the empire almost to the point which they had reached in the days when the state was Roman in fact as well as in name. In this period of triumph and of apparent prosperity no one could have foretold the appearance of a new power upon the scene—a power which would threaten the whole fabric of civilization and change the map of the known world. Yet such a power appeared, overcame the armies sent against it, and with unexampled

rapidity took possession of the fairest provinces of the East.

Until this time Arabia had not played a leading part in the drama of history. All earlier knowledge of this country shows its inhabitants to be scattered tribes separated by their deserts and by their mutual hostility. Persia and Byzantium had indeed welded the clans nearest their borders into petty kingdoms which they used each to annoy the other. But of Arabia as a single power they did not dream. Occasional forays of the bold desert dwellers in search of booty they were accustomed to suffer. *Now* there came the invasion of a new created nation. The scattered Bedawin were fired by a single purpose. Attila, the Scourge of God, was overmatched by Chalid, the Sword of God, and this terrible weapon hewed the devoted provinces of the East with tireless energy. Syria and Egypt fell at a single blow. Babylonia and Persia followed in an instant. In less than half a century from the time when Mohammed fled with a single companion from Mecca, the arms of his followers were triumphant from the Oxus to the site of Carthage. In another half century they had crossed the borders of India on the east, and to the west were checked only by the waves of the Atlantic. Their conquest of Spain and invasion of France are facts familiar to you, as is the battle of Tours or Poitiers by which Charles Martel preserved to Europe Roman Christianity and the civilization with which it was allied.

That such a movement deserves the attention of all students of history, is the merest truism. Its

political importance alone, however, would not make it the proper subject of this course of lectures. What makes it appropriate for this place and this occasion is its religious character. In this, to be sure, it is not unique. Many, I might say most, of the great movements of history have been religious. But few if any have shown their religious character so distinctly as the one before us. It calls itself by a religious name when it calls itself *Islam*, for Islam means resignation to the will of God. The war cry of the clans which crushed the arms of Byzantium was a profession of faith—"There is no God but Allah, and Moham-med is the Apostle of Allah." Islam has never denied or outgrown its religious character, for the same profession of faith is to this day repeated by one-tenth of the human race. Politically we may think it no longer formidable, but religiously it seems as strong as ever. With obstinate confidence in its own possession of the truth it resists the preaching of the Christian missionary, while itself sending missionaries into heathen lands. Because of this tenacity it must be reckoned with as a living force. Its dynasties may become extinct; its kingdoms may fall into the hands of foreigners; but ideas do not yield to force. They are not subjugated by the heavier artillery or crushed by the stronger battalions. Material forces enable Great Britain to govern the empire of the Great Mogul; they put Holland into possession of the Malay archipelago, and give France control of Algiers. But the real power which holds the hearts of the people in all these regions is the idea of Allah and His Apostle. For a long time now we have

flattered ourselves with hopes of the regeneration of the East, because a few young men in Constantinople have a varnish of Western education and of Western manners. The illusion has vanished and we see that the mass of the people are living in the ideas of a thousand years ago. There may be a more agreeable, there could scarcely be a more convincing, example of the tenacity of religion.

In a certain sense, our own time is able to appreciate the nature of this force as no preceding age has appreciated it. We have begun to see that there is a science of religion—a science which deals both with the history and with the philosophy of religion. And yet it is too much to say that this point of view is universally recognized. Even in the case of Islam, the attempt is still made to account for the phenomena by supposing some other force behind them. The most recent life of Mohammed * tries to explain his movement as a social rather than a religious revolution. Social distress bulks so largely in our own philosophy that we are tempted to give it an equally large place in the thoughts of other times. It is a sufficient present answer to this theory to say that we hear nothing of social claims in connection with the rise and spread of Islam. The cry of the hosts which subdued Asia was not for freedom of land or for relief from feudal burdens, either of taxation or service; it was not a demand for liberty or equality. Some of these things were more or less distinctly involved; but they were only indirectly involved. The formulated demand of the Moslem army was for the recognition

* Grimme, *Mohammed*, Erster Teil, Das Leben, Münster, 1892.

of Allah as the one God, and of Mohammed as His Apostle. They brought a creed for their watchword, and offered a Bible as their boon. This is where we may easily find the strength of Islam to-day. You may talk to an intelligent Mohammedan of the benefits given by modern progress. He will acknowledge that the civilization of Europe has some material advantages; but, in his heart, he will say that these are only the temporary enjoyments of a transitory world, and he will thank Allah that He has given him the better part in the promise of the world to come. To this day Mecca numbers among its inhabitants men who have emigrated from the countries where they enjoyed peace and security under Christian rule—emigrated because they could not feel at home under such rule, in spite of its material advantages. These men desire more than material advantages—"They desire to study the sacred sciences in a sacred place, to live in the neighborhood of celebrated and pious scholars or devotees, to do penance for former transgressions, to cleanse their filthy lucre by using it partly in religious works, or to spend their last days and to die on holy ground." This is the testimony of a man* who had unusual opportunities to know whereof he affirms. And all observers who have become acquainted with the real life of the people in Moslem lands confirm this testimony. The leading force in Eastern society is still religion.

What has been said is enough to show the importance of a study of this great religious movement. The inquirer into the history of mankind cannot

* Snouck-Hungronje, *Mekka*, II., p. 5.

ignore this striking episode. In any of its numerous aspects, Islam will repay investigation. But it is obvious that, for a single course of lectures, we must limit our field; and, for the present course, it is my purpose to consider only the beginnings. The history of a quarter of the globe through a period of thirteen centuries, is an immense subject. Internal and external wars, the rise and fall of dynasties, revolutions, crusades, philosophies, and theologies—these would require many volumes for their adequate treatment. To get a clear impression, we must limit our field; and the best place to begin is at the beginning. We do not ignore the fact that the Islam of to-day is in many respects different from the Islam which emerged from the wilderness twelve centuries ago. It may be true, as has been claimed, that one who studies the Koran and thinks himself acquainted with the Islam of to-day, is as far wrong as he would be who should study the Gospels and think himself acquainted with the Christianity of Hildebrand or of Pius the Ninth. We need to caution ourselves at this point, and not to assume that what is true of Mohammed and Omar is true also of the now ruling Sultan. But, when all is said, we know a good deal about a system when we know its beginnings. The stream is purest at its source. Principles are simpler when they first show their activity. Later developments may obscure them, but cannot change their essence. The later developments are better understood by the mastery of the earlier and simpler stages. And what is true in general is true, in a very special sense, of the movement before us. The

religion of Mohammed developed with great rapidity. During the lifetime of its founder it passed through the stages which Christianity took three centuries to traverse. In one sense this is a disadvantage. The growth would have been more healthy if it had been more deliberate. But it adds to the importance of the earliest period when this period contains so much. It is only the natural result that the dogmatic system of Islam not only assumed its final shape at a very early date, but that it adhered to one type with great tenacity. Development there was; but the development early became sectarian. The official, orthodox dogma overcame the sects, and this orthodox dogma was only the codification of ideas already prevalent in the first century of the Flight. For these reasons knowledge of the origin of Islam is the knowledge of the whole system, more truly than is the case in any other of the great historic religions.

But we must still further limit our inquiry. A general sketch of the rise of Mohammedanism would no doubt be of great interest, but it would still require more space than we can give it. We must choose some one of its many aspects, and fix our attention upon this single point, in the hope that the smallness of the field will conduce to clearness in the picture. Now, the point which I propose to examine is the influence which the Old and New Testaments have exerted upon this religion which is neither Judaism nor Christianity, though it shows such curious resemblances to both. These resemblances force themselves upon the notice of even the most superficial observer. Never was there a religion so little original

as this one. The dependence of one religion upon another is, however, not a rare phenomenon. Religious ideas emigrate more rapidly than the religions of which they are a part. All the religions of which we have competent knowledge, not excepting the religion of Israel, show foreign influence. The gods and myths of Greece were emigrants from Asia; Judaism borrowed from Babylonia; Christianity built upon the foundation inherited from Judaism. It is not strange, therefore, that Islam should use both Jewish and Christian ideas. So far from the lack of originality being a reason for ignoring the study of this religion, we may say that it is a special reason for studying it. Here is a great fact—the migration of religious beliefs. It is set before us in a striking example. Every consideration urges us to its close and attentive examination.

In examining the dependence of Islam upon the earlier religions we are met at the outset by one capital difficulty. Islam we know; the sources flow for us with greater copiousness than is true of any other religion. But the Judaism and Christianity of Arabia are almost unknown quantities. There was Judaism in Arabia. We suppose that it conformed in general to the type of other post-biblical Judaism. But how far it may have been affected by its surroundings is hard for us to say. There was Christianity in Arabia. But of its character we are even more ignorant than we are of Arabian Judaism. It seems quite certain that it was not the Christianity of the Greek Church. In all probability it existed in the form of some of the sects

stigmatized by the theologians as heretical. The type of heresy represented, however, can be only faintly conjectured. Now, in this state of ignorance, we are obliged to seek some fixed point, and this fixed point can be no other than the Bible. Whatever the Judaism of Arabia had, or had not, we are safe in assuming that it had the Hebrew Bible. In like manner, it is true of the Christianity of Arabia that it had a Bible, which, for the most part, was the same as the one which we ourselves hold sacred. For the comparison which we propose to make, the only practicable thing to do is to note what Biblical features appear in the religion of Mohammed. It is, of course, perfectly legitimate to note the form which these features assume in their new combination. If these are such as appear elsewhere in the Judaism of the Talmud, it will be perfectly legitimate to assume that Talmudic influence was at work. If the New Testament influences appear clouded by the tendencies which show themselves in the Apocryphal Gospels, we shall conclude that these tendencies were at work among the nominal Christians of Arabia. Nevertheless, the features which we seek are Biblical in their substance and their origin. Our two known quantities are the Bible and the sources of Islam.

It is significant at the very outset to notice that Mohammed, the founder of Islam, designated himself by two words borrowed from the Scriptures. One was borrowed directly in the Hebrew form—*naby*—and was intended to rank him with the Old Testament organs of revelation, the *prophets* of that dispensation. The other, *rasul*, was the translation of

the New Testament word which we render *apostle*, and was equally intended to class him with the organs of revelation in the Christian Church. We see, therefore, that the very terms in which the founder of the new religion announced himself expressed his adoption of Hebrew and Christian ideas. And that, with the words which he adopted, he had the Biblical idea is made plain by many passages of the Koran: "We have sent thee with the truth, as a bringer of tidings and a warner." * The prophets and apostles are well described by this word, for it was their work to warn their people of the judgments of God. It is evident, therefore, that Mohammed's starting-point was the fundamental position of revealed religion—that God speaks through chosen men, to make His will known to the world. This position is the key to his activity.

There are thinkers, however, to whom it is incomprehensible that a man should, in all honesty, put forward a claim to speak as the messenger of God. They are compelled to seek some ulterior motive for his activity. The whole mediæval world was of course incapable of understanding the Prophet of Islam. The only thing which those centuries could see was that Mohammed was the deadly enemy of their civilization. They could explain his impulse only as the direct act of Satan. In truth, the hordes of fierce and savage warriors which poured from Arabia and overran a large part of the known world, must have made upon their victims the impression

* Koran 2¹¹³, cf. 48⁸, 6⁴⁸. It should be noticed that God is uniformly the speaker in the Koran.

that hell had let loose all its demons. According to the prevalent theory of Christian writers down to very recent times, therefore, Mohammed was the most distinguished instrument of Satan.* Anti-christ is one of the names frequently applied to him. At the present day we may fairly regard this view as antiquated. Satan is not a preacher of truth, and we can hardly doubt that Mohammed was sincere in preaching the truth.

The seventeenth century had another explanation of the career of Mohammed. This explanation is explicitly stated in a treatise by the celebrated Dr. Prideaux, entitled, "The True Nature of Imposture, Fully Displayed in the Life of Mahomet."† The polemic nature of this tract (for it is little more) is sufficiently indicated in its title. The author conceives Mohammed to be moved by a desire to regain ancestral honors and wealth, which had been lost by his family. "These considerations meeting with an ambitious, aspiring mind, soon put him upon designs of raising himself to the supreme government of the country; and being a very subtile, crafty man, after having maturely weighed all ways and means whereby to bring this to pass, [he] concluded none so likely to effect it as the framing of that imposture which he afterward vented with so much

* The reverse opinion—that the Mohammedans were God's instruments of punishment for heresy or schism—was also maintained. Cf. Keller, *Der Geisteskampf des Christentums gegen den Islam*, 1896, pp. 12, 56.

† My copy is of the seventh edition, London, 1818, but the preface is dated 1696 97.

mischief to the world." * The author of the treatise, therefore, supposes Mohammed to go deliberately to work and frame a new religion as a means to the royal power. Substantially the same theory was carried out in the Bampton Lectures of 1784, which have for their subject: "A Comparison of Mahometanism and Christianity in their History, their Evidences and their Effects." In these lectures it is throughout assumed that the founder of Islam was an impostor, who, "by the mere force of a bold and fertile genius, assisted by a concurrence of circumstances universally auspicious to his design, was enabled to obtain the most unbounded empire over the minds, as well as persons, of a very large portion of mankind." † It is interesting to note that the position taken by these writers, who were moved thereto by the desire to defend Christianity, was also taken by Voltaire, who embodied it in his tragedy: "*Le Fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète*." ‡ By the author's own letter of dedication, this tragedy was directed against an imposture which brought into play the hypocrisy of some and the fury of others. In the play itself Mohammed is made to confess the ambition that is his motive. He is made to see with the

* Prideaux, *l. c.*, p. 7.

† Joseph White, *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford* in the year 1784 at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Bampton, M.A. Second Edition, London, 1811, p. 47. Cf. also p. 85, where Mohammed is described as the impostor "whose false and impious pretences to divine revelation were . . . crowned with success."

‡ *Œuvres Complètes* de Voltaire, 1785, Tome III. The Tragedy was first acted August 9, 1742.

eye of a modern historian, and discovers that Persia is feeble and Byzantium tottering. It is now the turn of Arabia to step upon the scene of action, and erect a monarchy upon the ruins of these. To secure this end a new religion is the best means, and for this end it is invented.*

Neither the English churchman nor the French sceptic had the key to Islam. Both judged the motive from the event. History shows us, however, very few instances in which the course of great movements was foreseen by those who originated them. Mohammed was no exception to the rule; in fact, he had less than the average prescience of what was to come. To show this, we need only look at the outline of his life.

It seems well established that throughout his early manhood, and until middle life, Mohammed showed no special ambition and no special capacity. We know very little of this period of his life, except that he was an orphan and poor, until his marriage with Chadija placed him in easy circumstances. He had established a character for honesty, for he was called *the Faithful*. But his religion was the religion of his city, as is abundantly shown by the fact that he named a son *Abd Menâf* for one of the heathen deities. When about forty years old† the crisis of his

* *Op. cit.* Acte II., Scène V.

† I give the traditional data. Great uncertainty hangs over Mohammed's early life, especially over the chronology. For the epithet *Faithful* see: *Das Leben Mohammed's nach Mohammed Ibn Ishak bearbeitet von Ibn Hisham, übersetzt von Dr. Gustav Weil.* Stuttgart, 1864, I., p. 94, and Sprenger, *Leben Mohammeds*, I., p. 526. The name *Abd Menâf* for Mohammed's son is given by

life came. He passed through a severe spiritual conflict, and, at the end of it, came forth as a preacher. He began to reason with his countrymen concerning righteousness and a judgment to come, and, at real risk to himself, denounced their idolatry as contrary to the will of God. Before attributing interested motives to such a man we should have clear and convincing proofs. As to his personality, the impression made upon us by the records of this early ministry, and to a considerable extent confirmed by his later history, is that of a modest, retiring man. He was, even when in possession of power, rather reticent, shrinking from prominent activity, lacking in decision. The internal conflict from which he suffered was brought about by what he felt was a call to preach. His conscience urged him to obey, but his natural timidity held him back. In all this he betrays no deep-laid scheme of any kind. He would apparently have been satisfied with the conversion of his native city, and would have been content to leave the government in the hands of the chiefs who already possessed it. The singleness of his motive was indicated moreover by his steadfastness through years of neglect, contempt, abuse, and even persecution. The Meccans had no special objection to his religion so long as it was simply a personal matter. They would have been quite content to have him get salvation in his own way, if only he would not preach against the publicly established

Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen-und Abendlande*, I., p. 48; and the tradition that Mohammed offered a white sheep to the goddess Uzzah, by Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III., p. 30.

worship. But it was precisely this which Mohammed felt called to do. The chiefs of the Meccans came to Abu Talib (Mohammed's uncle and protector) and complained of the preaching, whereupon the uncle remonstrated with his nephew. Mohammed supposed that he was going to lose the protection of the clan, in which case his life would not have been safe for an hour. Nevertheless, he said, with tears in his eyes: "Though the sun at my right hand and the moon at my left were to command me to give up this matter, I would not give it up."*

In this persistence in his calling Mohammed is not unworthy of being compared with the Old Testament prophets. He reminds us of Jeremiah, who was commanded to preach though he was told that the kings of Judah, and the princes, priests, and people would fight against him. The parallel with some of the Old Testament prophets is the more exact in that Mohammed was apparently slow of speech. In his private life he was taciturn. That when he spoke in public he had difficulty in expressing his thought, seems evident from the phenomena of the Koran. The frequent repetition of the same thoughts, and even the same phrases, shows lack of facility. In many passages we are compelled to think that he was not able to express his thought with clearness. He is fond of figures and metaphors, yet he rarely succeeds in carrying one out consistently. He was far from being a natural orator, and he would have been strangely self-deceived if he had supposed that his eloquence would make his countrymen subservient to his de-

* Weil, *Ibn Hisham*, I., p. 125.

signs. And his experience is just in line with the other evidence on this head. His countrymen had small patience with his harangues. They stigmatized them as the ravings of one possessed, or as the fables of the ancients. Putting these indications together we must agree with an eminent authority on this subject* when he says: "He was not a master of the language—which explains the frequent repetitions in the Koran. He composed with difficulty; he rarely found at once the word which correctly expressed his thought. He tried it therefore in different ways, and hence we find the same ideas recur continually in the Koran, only in different words. More than one example shows us that the prophet did not find the appropriate form until after repeated attempts." The matter concerns us here only so far as it affects the sincerity of Mohammed. All the indications point him out as one of the last men to attempt a career which should make him play the part of an orator.

Looking at him more closely, it may be confessed without hesitation that Mohammed was not a man after the pattern which most commends itself to us. His personality is one of the most difficult to comprehend in all history, for it seems to us to unite contradictory traits. Frugality and lavishness, temperance and sensual grossness, indecision and firmness, gentleness and cruelty, piety and treachery, all appear by turns; and the opposites are often in immediate juxtaposition. It is difficult for us modern men of the Aryan race to combine these features in a single pict-

* Dozy, *Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Islamisme*, Traduit par Chauvin, Leyde et Paris, 1879, p. 119.

ure. It is no more than a commonplace to say that a Semite, a Bedawy, an Arab brought up in heathenism, must be measured by the Semitic standard of twelve hundred years ago. That, measured by this standard, he was no ordinary man is clear from the influence which he exerted during his life, and which has only increased since his death. To the present day, the Prophet enters into the life of his followers to an extent difficult for us to imagine. Nearly all books written by Moslems contain in the preface a eulogy of Mohammed—even works of the imagination like the Arabian Nights. Once a year the birthday of the Prophet is celebrated by the Moslem world, and it is the universal custom to hear the story of his life, or poems in his praise. The number of biographies of him is very great; almost every Arabic author of note has written one. To cast a slur on the name of Mohammed in a Moslem country will excite a mob much more certainly than blasphemy of the name of Jesus will excite one in any Christian country. The Arabic press continues to issue yearly new biographies or books of devotion, in which the exemplary character of the Prophet is set forth for the imitation of the faithful. Even in Mecca, where one would expect feeling to be made callous to this theme by long use, the recitation of a poem in his honor calls forth sighs and tears of longing: *

“ My heart yearns, O Apostle of God, to thee,
But Ah! I am heavy laden with my sins.”

It need not be denied that in this devotion there is

* Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, II., p. 74.

something of superstition. The Bedawin, like most people in a comparatively low state of civilization, are prone to reverence saints. And when we read how the people in Mohammed's campaigns would take the water in which he had performed his ablutions and rub it on their hands and faces, we confess that he was the object of an unreasoning devotion. But this is recorded only of the later years of his life, when his following was increased by the scarcely converted desert tribes, to whom a prophet was only a sooth-sayer or magician under another name. The early and more intimate companions of the Prophet were not of this class. Omar impresses us as one of the sanest, clearest headed men that ever lived. Abu Bekr, also, though a man of tender religious sensibilities, possessed a sober and practical common-sense, far removed from fanaticism. That this was not mere superstitious devotion to a supposed wonder-working wizard which Mohammed called forth, is evident from others besides these intimate friends. When Saad Ibn Rabia lay on the battle-field in the article of death, he said to a friend who watched by him : "I am dying ; greet the Apostle of Allah for me and say : God reward thee for what thou hast done for us, as He rewarded the other prophets. Greet also the Helpers for me and say : God will not forgive them if harm comes to their prophet." In one of the campaigns Zeid Ibn al-Dathana was taken captive and brought to Mecca, where he was put to death. Just before he was executed one of the spectators asked : "Would you not rather be with your family and that Mohammed should be in your place here?"

The reply was: "I would not have Mohammed pricked with a thorn if thereby I might be in safety with my family." Nowhere was this loyalty more evident than when there was a real grievance. In one of his later campaigns Mohammed disposed of the booty in a manner that quite overlooked the claims of his veteran followers. Their murmurs came to his ears, and gathering them around him he spoke a few words of recognition. All hearts turned to him and the Helpers* broke down in tears, crying: We are content with our portion and our lot. Another example recalls to us the chivalry of Uriah the Hittite. Abu Chaithama came home from the army to fetch grain. The day was hot, and his wives had pitched the tents in the shade of his garden. They also sprinkled them for coolness and prepared refreshing meat and drink. He looked at it all and said: "The Apostle of Allah is exposed to the sun and the wind and the heat; and shall I spend my time with my wife in the cool shade before a spread table? That is not right. I will not enter your tent but follow Mohammed." He turned away and as soon as his grain was ready he mounted his camel and went his way.†

These examples, which might easily be multiplied, show that it was not mere superstition which drew followers to the Prophet. They felt that this man had brought them real benefit, and their hearts were drawn not only by the benefit they had experienced but also by the qualities of the man. Some of these

* The Helpers (*Anṣar*) are the people of Medina who welcomed Mohammed when he fled from Mecca.

† These examples are taken from Weil, *Ibn Hisham*, pp. 31, 71, 252, 261.

qualities we can appreciate. For one thing, he was modest in his opinion of himself. When he first came to Medina and saw the people fertilizing the pistillate palms with sprigs of the staminate blossoms, he remarked that it might be as well not to do it. Hereupon some of the people left off, and when their crops of dates came short, they naturally reproached him. He made no defence, but confessed that he was fallible except where divinely guided. Although his followers persisted in discovering miracles wrought by him, he expressly declared his inability to work them, and that in a passage which reveals his great desire to work them: "I cannot provide myself with what is useful or [ward off] what is hurtful except as God wills. If I knew the secret things I would desire great good, and evil should not touch me; but I am only a warner and bringer of tidings to a people who believe."* According to an early tradition he deprecates extravagant honors: "Praise me not as Jesus the son of Mary is praised; call me the servant of God and His Apostle."† When one of his followers and a Jew were disputing about the comparative merits of their respective prophets, Mohammed said: "Do not put me above Moses." He had, moreover, a distinct sense of his own sinfulness. Ayesha asked him: Do none enter Paradise except through the favor of God? No! he replied, none enter but through God's favor. The question was asked and answered

* Koran 7¹⁸⁸, and cf. 6³⁵ *et al.* In *Bochari*, III., p. 149, Mohammed intimates that his judgment in legal decisions is not infallible.

† Cited by Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II., p. 279.

three times. Then she said : You, also, O Prophet, will not you enter but by God's compassion ? Putting his hand upon his head he replied : I also shall not enter unless God cover me with His mercy.* The consciousness of sin was, in fact, the starting-point of his religion. His prayers always contained a petition for forgiveness. He desired the intercession of his friends, as he in turn interceded for them. That he also laid the case of his enemies before God, and invoked punishment upon them need cause us no surprise.†

Mohammed was gentle and considerate in his intercourse with men. He rebukes himself in the Koran because in his anxiety to conciliate a nobleman, he once turned away from a poor blind man who wished to inquire of him.‡ A poor negro who swept the mosque at Medina died and was buried without the Prophet being informed. On hearing of it later, he rebuked those who had neglected to tell him, inquired for the grave, and prayed over it as he was accustomed to do for his friends.§ The support of his household was often a matter of anxiety to him, but he was always mindful of those more needy, so that it was not without ground that his followers called him the protector of orphans and the defence of the poor. More surprising, in an oriental, is his kindness toward animals. Although the dog is unclean of the

* *Mishcat ul Masabih* (English translation), I., p. 280.

† *Bochari*, I., p. 140 ; II., p. 14.

‡ Koran 80^l f. This is the traditional occasion for the passage. Grimme objects to the tradition, but I see no sufficient reason for rejecting it.

§ *Bochari*, II., p. 84.

Moslem, as he is to the Jew, yet Mohammed praised the man who showed kindness to a thirsty dog.* He promised a reward also to the man who watered a stray camel, and, consistently with this, he threatened a woman with hell because she had starved a cat.†

Quite as prominent as his kindness was the good sense he showed in matters where, if he were a fanatic, he might be expected to be extreme. At one time he inclined to ascetic devotion, and stood in prayer so long that his feet swelled, or so long that their skin cracked and they bled. But when his followers showed similar excess of zeal, he restrained them, saying: The body has a claim on you.‡ Although not without superstition himself, he discouraged it in others even where it might have seemed to his advantage to connive at it. The day that his infant son Ibrahim died, there was an eclipse of the sun. The Moslems were inclined to connect the two events. But Mohammed said: "No! the sun is not eclipsed for the death of any human being; eclipses are among the miracles of God; when you see them, engage in prayer."

If Mohammed shows many attractive personal

* "When a man journeys and his thirst consumes him and he comes to a well and drinks, then comes away and sees a famished dog gnawing the dirt in his thirst, and says: This animal is in the condition in which I was; then fills his boot and holds its mouth and comes and gives the dog to drink—God rewards such a man and forgives him. The people said: O, Apostle of Allah, do we receive a reward in the matter of animals? He replied: For every animal [literary: *for every moist liver*] there is a reward."—*Bochari*, III., p. 71. Cf. also Wellhausen's *Vakidi*, p. 327.

† *Mishcat*, II., p. 42.

‡ *Bochari*, II., pp. 41, 226.

characteristics, he shows also many that are repulsive, especially to our age. That they were not obnoxious in the eyes of his own age is evident from the very devotion which we have been considering. The standard of the times was not very elevated. After the battle of Ohod, Hind, the wife of one of Mohammed's enemies, sought out among the slain the body of Hamza, Mohammed's uncle, who had fallen in the Moslem cause. Having found it, she cut off the nose and ears, which she made into bracelets. She then tore open the trunk and cut out the liver, which she had vowed to eat. Although she was not able to carry out the vow, the whole scene casts a lurid light upon the state of society in which Mohammed grew up. In such a society, the faults which are so prominent to us did not attract serious attention. It is always difficult to say just how far a man should be judged by the standard of his own times. But we may fairly claim that any indulgence granted to Biblical heroes on this plea should be granted also to Mohammed. The state of Arabia in the seventh century was not unlike the state of Canaan two millenniums earlier. The assassinations prompted by Mohammed should be judged as we judge the deeds of Ehud and Jael. His slaughter of the Jews stands by the side of Joshua's extermination of the Canaanites. His indulgence in wives was not more profuse than David's, and fell far short of Solomon's luxury. Like David, he coveted his neighbor's wife, but he did not murder her husband, and he did not take possession of her until she had been divorced. He cursed his enemies, but so did the Psalmist; and the plea made

for the Psalmist, that the objects of his imprecations were the enemies of the cause of God, was precisely the plea that Mohammed would have made in all sincerity.

These things are not said as a justification. Tried by any standard the Prophet of Mecca falls short of perfection. But if we are to appreciate his work we must not let his faults blind us to his real character. That character is defined when we say he was a sincerely religious man. "Did you know what I know (he is reported to have said)—did you know what I know of the future state, you would laugh little and weep much." * This sentence gives us the key to his life and to his power. He had a vivid sense of the great verities—the being of God, the evil of sin, the future life. He succeeded in impressing these upon the movement of which he was the head, and they make it what it is—one of the great religions of the world.

Before we proceed further it will be necessary to define the sources from which we get our knowledge of Islam. The difficulty which confronts us is the embarrassment of riches. Islam has a long history and a copious literature. In the course of its history it has developed sectarian differences, as great as those which divide professing Christians. Seventy-three sects of Mohammedans were long ago counted, and in the number was found the fulfillment of a prophecy ascribed to Mohammed.† But as we have limited

* *Mishcat*, I., p. 327.

† The tradition appears in different forms: "The Banu Israel were divided into seventy-two tribes, and my people will be seventy-

our inquiry to the origin and early stages of Islam, sectarian differences do not concern us. For this inquiry, one document is of the very first importance, and that document is, of course, the Koran. This book is recognized by all parties of Moslems as the foundation of their faith. Even if there were doubt as to its integrity and its authenticity it would still be of prime importance for the history of Islam. But there is no reason to suspect either its integrity or its authenticity. The assurances we have on this point are very complete. The prime fact is that the revelations were committed to memory by a large body of converts during the life of Mohammed. He emphasized this as a meritorious act, and thereby increased the number of living custodians of the word. The book was formally edited and published soon after his death, and when divergences began to appear in the copies of this edition, a new one was published with new safeguards for its correctness. There can be no reasonable doubt that the copies in our hands correspond very closely with this original, and that this original does not vary in any important particular from the text recited by Mohammed himself. This does not mean that we have the complete body of what he published. Some revelations have probably perished; others were worked over and changed by Mohammed himself. But we may rest assured

three. Every one will go to hell except one."—*Mishcat*, I., p. 50. The more elaborate form gives the Zoroastrians seventy sects, the Jews seventy-one, Christians seventy-two, and Islam seventy-three. Dozy, *l'Islamisme*, p. 196. Haarbrücker, *Schahrastani's Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen* (1850), I., p. 3. The tradition is no doubt an invention.

that what we have in this volume represents his thought as he uttered it during some part of his career.

It is well known that the Koran is regarded as the Book of God, in the strictest sense. God appears throughout as the speaker, and the devout Moslem has the most exalted idea of its excellence. "People are not assembled together in mosques to read the Book of God without light and comfort descending upon them; the favor of God covers them, angels encompass them round about, and God reckons them among His angels." * This tradition, ascribed to Mohammed, correctly represents his idea, and that of his followers. He is reported to have said further: "The most illustrious of my followers are those who know the Koran by heart, and those who pray in the night." † When a number of Moslems had fallen in battle, those among them who knew the most of the Koran were most honored in their burial. Omar expressed surprise that one of his governors should appoint a freedman to an important office. When told that the man knew the Koran, he approved the appointment. Mohammed challenged his contemporaries to produce a single chapter equal to his in excellence, and it is now an article of faith that the challenge cannot be met. All these are indications of the fundamental importance of this book.

When we come to the Koran for information, however, we are much perplexed, for we find it to be a book without form or plan. It is a collection of dis-

* *Mishcat*, I., p. 55.

† *Ibid.*, p. 264.

connected compositions, which were uttered at intervals during a period of more than twenty years. When they were written down, no pains were taken to indicate date or occasion of composition. Fragments of different dates were joined to make a single chapter, or new sections were interpolated in chapters already complete. When the final redaction was made, it was altogether mechanical in its arrangement. The only principle discoverable is that the longest chapters come first and the shortest last. Within the several chapters the transitions are abrupt and without apparent motive, and when we add that the repetition of set phrases is a standing feature, we are not surprised that, to the Western mind, the book is unattractive and its study anything but a pleasure. For our present purpose, however, these drawbacks do not weigh so heavily as they would if our purpose were purely historical. For a life of Mohammed, it is a great disadvantage not to be able to date the suras.* But our present inquiry is less concerned with the progressive stages of the Prophet's thought, than with the total of his religion. We might almost say that it is not of so much importance for us to discover what he meant as it is to discover what his contemporaries supposed him to mean. For it is this which has made Islam what it is. What they supposed him to mean we can generally discover, for

* A *sura* is one of the divisions (chapters) of the Koran. The word seems to be borrowed from the Hebrew, where it meant a row of stones in a wall. The principle of arrangement, if we may call it so, is not applied with absolute rigor. The first *sura* is a short one.

exegetical tradition is, in its main features, constant. In one respect we are better off than the exegetes themselves, for they are under a dogmatic bias from which we are free.

Second to the Koran—but second to it alone—we have another source for the knowledge of Islam in a great body of traditions concerning the Prophet. To understand the place which it occupies we need only recall the position of the Moslem community after the death of Mohammed. Up to that time, he had been accustomed to answer every question that arose. *He was the law.* When he was taken away, they still had a law in the Koran. But this was not enough. No book of rules can provide for every case that may arise. Mohammed, moreover, had always left something to oral teaching. It was not his intention that the Koran alone should be the rule of life. His own example was to be a guide, as is expressly stated in the Koran itself.* In a tradition, he is reported as saying: “What I have commanded to believers outside the Koran is equal in quality to the Koran itself, or even greater.”† Whether the tradition is authentic or not, it undoubtedly represents the consensus of Mohammedan opinion. From it we can understand the anxiety to preserve the remembrance of Mohammed’s deeds and words.

The necessity of collecting the traditions was not simply private or personal. Questions arose con-

* “The Apostle of Allah is an excellent pattern to him who fears Allah and the Last Day.” (33²¹.) The tradition confirms this.—*Bochari*, II., 152.

† *Mishcat*, I., p. 48.

cerning the state. Public law and administration had to be dealt with in just the same way as matters of individual right and wrong. If these questions were not answered by the Koran, they must be answered in some other way. Here, too, the most natural recourse was the precedents set by the original ruler. There was, to be sure, a possibility of arguing by analogy, and so of making the written law cover cases which were not directly provided for. But analogy is not always convincing, and the jurists early showed their distrust of it.* Even with the best will in the world, the Koran could not be made to decide every question that arose.

These considerations show the importance which tradition early assumed in the public and private life of the Moslem. It is not different in other religions. The Jews have their Talmud for an authority along with the Bible. The early Church recognized Apostolic tradition as part of the rule of faith, and even those modern churches which have discarded tradition, find the need of Confessions, Canons, and Books of Discipline. In like manner there stands by the side of the Koran a body of tradition, almost equally venerated and more exactly obeyed. The process in this case stands in the clear light of history. When, immediately after the death of Mohammed, all Arabia seemed to revolt from Islam, attempts were made to treat with Abu Bekr for new conditions of peace. But the Caliph was like iron in maintaining what the Prophet had imposed—"If they withhold a kid from that which the Prophet required of

* Cf. Goldziher, *Die Zahiriten* (1884), p. 5 ff.

them, I will declare war," was his declaration.* The precedent was decisive. Henceforth the example of the Prophet was law to the whole of Islam.

The consequence could easily be foreseen. The intellectual activity of the new religion was turned to two subjects—the study of the Koran and the collection of traditions. This was the beginning of Moslem science, and seldom has science had more devoted disciples. For two centuries the traditionists pursued their task, undisturbed by the storm of war which raged about them. They collected and preserved from the Helpers and Companions all that these could remember of the sayings and deeds of the Prophet. They took at second, third, and fourth hand all that was alleged to have come from the Helpers and Companions. The result was an enormous mass of material, which the more earnest and less biassed minds saw must be proved and sifted. Of the zeal in collecting, we have an example in Gabir Ibn Abdullah, who went a month's journey to hear a single tradition.† Not a few journeyed from one end of the Mohammedan world to the other for the sake of this knowledge. What was done in the way of testing and editing may be judged from the statement of Bochari that from six hundred thousand traditions he had selected only a little over seven thousand.‡

* Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen* (1875), I., p. 14.

† Bochari, I., p. 25.

‡ The system of traditional science is set forth by Professor Salisbury in a paper entitled *Contributions to our Knowledge of*

It is apart from our present purpose to go at length into the subject of tradition. Yet to illustrate the pains taken by Mohammedans in preserving the recollections of their prophet, I will venture to quote a single example. It reads as follows: "Adam Ibn Abi Iyās tells us that Shaybān tells us from Mansur from Mujāhed from Taus from Ibn Abbās (God be pleased with both of them) that the Prophet (God bless and save him) said on the day of the surrender of Mecca: There is no more [duty of] Flight, but the Holy War and the Intention; and when you are called to the Holy War, then go!"* The substance of the tradition is here a saying of the Prophet. But it might be as well, an action of his or a refusal to act, or his silence. The meaning of the saying here given is that, whereas before the conquest of Mecca, there rested upon believers an obligation to flee from that city as Mohammed himself had done, the obligation was now abrogated. But the merit of the action will be acquired by him who engages in war with unbelievers, or who sets his mind to accomplish the end which could formerly be reached only by flight, that is, to avoid temptation to apostasy. The importance of preserving such a *dictum* will be seen at once.

the Science of Muslim Tradition in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. VII. (1860), pp. 60-142.

Six collections of traditions enjoy favor among the Moslems. I cannot claim acquaintance with any but Bochari, for which I have used the vocalized version, Bulak, without date. I cite from this by volume and page, as the traditions are not numbered. I have read, also, Captain Matthew's English translation of the *Mishcat-ul-Masabih*, Calcutta, 1809, 1810, two volumes, quarto.

* *Bochari*, IV., p. 35. The same tradition, II., p. 197.

Equally important is it that the dictum should be known to come from Mohammed. And it was with the desire to assure this, that the traditionists preserved in every case the chain of witnesses who reported the tradition. In the case cited, the saying went through six hands before it reached the author who put it on paper. It is obvious that defective memory or lack of veracity on the part of any one of these would vitiate the credibility of the tradition. The Moham-medan authors are well aware of this, and the critical activity which resulted in the rejection of so large a number of traditions consisted largely in an examination of the credibility of the narrators. That the editors were not free from bias in their decisions is only what we might expect. They were novices in the science of criticism, and could hardly be expected rightly to weigh tendencies which our own time has only begun to appreciate. In truth the Hadith* must be regarded with marked scepticism, so far as it is used as a source for the life of Mohammed. The forgery or invention of traditions began very early. The Companions were not always too scrupulous to clothe their own opinions in the form of anecdotes. The greatest number of traditions are related by men who were very young when the Prophet came to Medina. One of these defends himself for remembering so many things that others could not recall†—a case where self-excuse is self-accusation. To

* *Hadith* is the technical term for a tradition of whatever kind. *Sunna* is customary law, generally, but not necessarily, based on tradition. Cf. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II., p. 11.

† *Bochari*, III., p. 2.

invent what would cast honor on the name of the Apostle of God would seem to those times a meritorious fault, if fault at all, while there would be even stronger temptation to suppress anything that would not comport with his reputation. The same Companion (Abu Horaira) who defended himself for the profuseness of his memory, also confessed that he had two sorts of recollections; one sort he was accustomed to relate, but it would have been as much as his life was worth to relate to others. These natural tendencies were magnified by the party spirit which early became rife in Islam. Each party counted among its adherents immediate followers of Moham-med. Each was anxious to justify itself by an appeal to his words and deeds. It is only the natural result that traditions with a notoriously party bias were circulated at an early day. A traditionist of the first rank admits that pious men were inclined to no sort of fraud so much as to the invention of traditions.* The jurists moreover found that new legal precedents were almost a necessity, and (as in other systems of law) fiction was used as a means of adapting old laws to new cases. The jurists therefore encouraged the multiplication of traditions without any close inquiry into their authenticity.

From our point of view, therefore, many traditions, even if well authenticated to external appearance, bear internal evidence of forgery. For example, we read that the Apostle of Allah said: "The resurrection will not take place until people kill their own

* See the citation, Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II., p. 47.

Imam [or divinely appointed ruler] and kill one another with swords and until a tyrannical king shall reign." * There is an evident reference here to the killing of Ali and the succession of the Ommayyads to the throne. An orthodox Moslem would see no objection to the probability of Mohammed's uttering such a prediction. His criticism could hardly be expected to question it; while to us it bears evident marks of a later date.

I may give here an anecdote which illustrates the way in which the pious mind shrinks from too sharp criticism, or indeed from any criticism, of the documents which it has been accustomed to regard as sacred. A leading authority on the Hadith was once lecturing on the evidence for and against doubtful traditions, when a friend dropped in at the exercise. On being asked the subject of discussion, the lecturer replied: I am inquiring into the reliability and unreliability of certain scholars. "Are you not ashamed before God," asked the intruder, "to slander men who have already been in Paradise a hundred or two hundred years?" The lecturer broke down in tears, and said: "Oh! if my ears had only heard these words before I began my work, I would never have composed it!" The book fell from his hand and he was so much moved that he could not continue the lecture.†

Where the pious feeling enlists itself on the side of tradition we can hardly expect criticism to be very radical. The leading Moslem traditionists were men

* *Mishcat*, II., p. 533.

† Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II., p. 272 f.

of this cast. Bochari never recorded a tradition without performing the ablution, and a prayer of four prostrations. He sincerely desired to get at the truth, and it is greatly to his credit that he brought himself to reject so large a proportion of the literature which he had been taught to regard with reverence. But we cannot suppose that his work or that of other editors like-minded with him is final.

Our conclusion is that for the life of Mohammed this great body of material must be used with great caution. But when the interest is rather in the first generations of Moslems than in Mohammed individually, the case is somewhat better. It has already been remarked of the Koran, that what the early believers supposed it to mean is nearly as valuable to us as what it actually means, or as what Mohammed intended it to mean. In the same way we can say of the traditions — what the early Moslems suppose Mohammed to have said is nearly as valuable for us as what he actually did say. For we are concerned with the formative period of his religion, and this period extends beyond his death. Let me suppose in illustration that some Christian at the end of the second century had gathered and recorded for us all that oral tradition had to say of the words and actions of Jesus Christ. Seven thousand such fragments would be of priceless value. We could not be sure that in more than a small fraction of cases the tradition was reliable. The material could not be used for a life of Christ without great caution. Oral tradition is a doubtful thing. It is liable to suspicion in an increasing ratio as it passes through three, four,

or five mouths. Yet such a collection would reveal to us the thoughts, beliefs, and customs of the early Church, and in this regard it would be beyond price. Such a collection we have for Islam. Bochari, the editor to whom I have alluded, lived through the first half of the third century of the Mohammedan era (he died A.H. 256). We cannot doubt that, with the care he took, the material he gathered was all considerably older than himself. It is not too much to assume that the traditions represent the views of the first hundred years after the death of Mohammed, and we may therefore use them to form our picture of primitive Islam.

So much it was necessary to say in order to justify the use of the traditions in our inquiry. We must not come to them, however, with extravagant expectations. We are inclined to suppose that the Biblical element in these will be large from the fact that so many converts were early made from both Judaism and Christianity. But the expectation is disappointed. For one thing, the interest of the compilers of tradition is very different from our own. They have preserved what is of secondary importance to us, while doubtless much of what they have discarded would be to us a welcome source of light. It seems, moreover, that the Koran had already, even in the first century of Islam, fully impressed itself as the supreme law, so that the tradition, while it illustrates, does not often add anything to its essential contents. The Koran remains the chief source of our knowledge.

The purpose of this lecture is fulfilled if it has set

before you the nature of the problem with which we have to deal. The plan of the lectures sufficiently shows the order which the inquiry will follow. The plan itself indicates the close connection of Islam in its structure with the system which prevails in Judaism and in Christianity. If the plan proves to be in accordance with the facts presented by the sources already described, I shall consider that the inquiry is both interesting and profitable.

LECTURE II.

THE COMMON BASIS IN HEATHENISM

No religion has been successful which did not borrow something from the predecessor which it tried to displace. The Church discovered this when it adopted and consecrated heathen festivals, heathen shrines, and even heathen divinities, making them into Christian feasts, Christian altars, and Christian saints. Islam had a similar experience. Its immediate predecessor was a heathenism from which Mohammed turned away and which he would have entirely suppressed had it been possible. But, without himself realizing what he did, he was driven to borrow from heathenism. We readily see how this came about. He was brought up in heathenism—until he was forty years old he conformed to its customs. Whatever religion he had until that time was connected with the worship of the Meccans. We have no reason to doubt that he was a sincerely religious man, when he sacrificed a kid to Uzza at the Kaaba, or when he called a son Abd Menâf for one of the false gods. When his new convictions came, he gave up whatever was contradictory to them. Probably he tried at first to make a clean sweep of the old religion. He gave up the sanctuary, for at Medina he made Jeru-

saalem the point toward which the prayers of the believers should be directed. But even this was a strain on his habit. So after a time the Kibla was changed to the Kaaba again. Partly this may be accounted for by his experience with the Jews. When he came to Medina he felt that he could gain them to his party. He was convinced that his religion and theirs were one in substance, and of course he saw no reason why they should not at once unite with him. In this he overrated his knowledge of their religion, and underrated the obstinacy of their convictions. When he saw that his hopes were not likely to be realized, he changed the Kibla. That his motive was to gratify his affection for the ancestral sanctuary rather than to alienate the Jews, is evident from the Koran, which says: "We have seen thee turning thy face about towards the [different parts of the] heavens, and We will cause thee to turn to a Kibla that will please thee. Therefore turn thy face in the direction of the sacred House,* and wherever you are, turn your faces in its direction, and those who receive the Book will know that this is the truth from thy Lord; and God is not ignorant of what they do." The plain implication of the passage is that Mohammed was restless under his own ordinance which fixed the Kibla at Jerusalem. His heart yearned toward the ancient sanctuary. His desire was gratified by the command to make that again the central point of his religion.

Although the motive in this was so largely personal, yet there is no doubt that it was a real step toward gaining the Arabs. The new Kibla was to

* Literally, *Mosque*, or place of prostration. The passage is 2¹³⁹.

them a notification that the new religion was to be national. The reconciliation between Mohammed's belief in the genuineness of Judaism and his belief in the genuineness of the Kaaba, was effected by an ingenious use of Abraham. How he came to this is difficult to make out. The theory of Moslem writers that the heathen Arabs already knew Abraham as the builder of the Kaaba must be viewed with suspicion. Still there is a possibility that Abraham, or *an* Abraham was known to the Mec-cans and connected with their worship.* The motive of Mohammed is evident. All great religious leaders have sought points of union with the past. It seems to them evident that a purer faith was accepted in the earlier ages, and they claim therefore to be restorers rather than originators. Such was the claim of Mohammed. Christianity and Judaism both had made Abraham the Father of the Faithful. The Old Testament account makes him a builder of altars. What more natural than that Mohammed should suppose him the founder of the Kaaba? Later tradition was not content with even this antiquity. It supposes the sacred building to have been first erected by Adam in imitation of the heavenly sanctuary which he had seen in Paradise before his expulsion. It also affirms that this

* The Station of Abraham is mentioned in tradition as though it were a part of the Kaaba (or possibly a name for the whole Kaaba) before the conquest of Mecca. Cf. *Bochari*, I., p. 97, where Omar says that he suggested to Mohammed the words (Kor., 2¹¹⁹): "And take the Station of Abraham as a place of prayer." The Station of Abraham is the name now given to a part of the area of the Haram at Mecca.

heavenly House is located just over the earthly Kaaba. But these refinements are later than the time of Mohammed, who was satisfied to carry the sacred place back to Abraham.*

The Kibla—that is, turning the face to a particular point of the compass in worship—is itself an institution of great antiquity. It is perhaps never absent from early religions. When men have a distinct place in which their Deity dwells, they naturally turn toward that place in paying their devotions. One of the gravest accusations against Israel is that they turn their faces to the sun and their backs to the Temple of Yahweh.† The prayer of Solomon intimates that worshippers even in distant lands would pray toward the temple.‡ The custom of Daniel is well known. The institution of the Kibla is therefore ancient in Judaism and very likely goes back to Semitic heathenism. In Islam it is really a survival. For Mohammed made God's dwelling-place to be heaven, and there was no real meaning in an earthly sanctuary. He himself says: "To God belongs the East and the West; wherever you turn, there is the face of God." And again: "Piety does not consist in turning your faces toward the East or toward the

* Judaism also locates the heavenly throne just above the earthly Temple, and this seems to have been adopted by Mohammed. For in the Night Journey he went first to Jerusalem and thence ascended to heaven. The Mohammedan tradition which ascribed the first building to Adam, allows that this structure was destroyed in the Deluge and rebuilt by Abraham.

† Ezek. 8¹⁷, where the text has been purposely changed to obscure a drastic phrase.

‡ 1 Kings 8. Cf. Dan. 6¹⁰.

West. Pious is he who believes in God and the Last Day." * But custom was too strong for logic, as has often been the case in other religions.

To custom also, aided by a sense of expediency, we must attribute the retention of the Kaaba itself as a fetish—I know of no other word that will fit the case. For the Kaaba is one of the sacred stones of which Semitic religion knows so many. The process by which they become sacred is vividly brought before us by the experience of Jacob. The wayfarer has a dream in which a divine being appears to him. On waking, he associates the divinity with some conspicuous stone—perhaps the one which he has used as a pillow. The stone becomes an object of worship. It receives the oblation of oil or a vow of the tithes. From this time on, the stone and the God are identified; the more ignorant worshippers identify them absolutely, the more intelligent say that the God dwells in the stone, which therefore becomes a Beth-El. A number of such idols or fetishes are known to have existed in Arab heathenism. Dhu-l-Chalāḡa, a white stone, once an idol, is now the threshold of a mosque at Tabala, where it was formerly worshipped. Dusares of Petra, a still more ancient example, is described as a black, rectangular, uncut stone four feet high and two feet thick. One of the names for it seems to have been *kaaba*.† The prevalence of stone worship among the heathen Arabs is attested by the Moslem writers, in that they were compelled

* Koran 2¹⁰⁹, 172.

† The examples are from Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III., pp. 42 f., 46; cf. also pp. 50, 54.

to invent a theory to account for it. The theory is thus given by the earliest biographers of Mohammed whose work has come down to us: * "Others believe that the beginning of idolatry among the sons of Ishmael was that the Meccans, when their land became too straight for them, spread abroad over the country, and all took stones from their sanctuary [the Kaaba], out of reverence for their temple, and they set them up wherever they formed a settlement; and they walked around them as they used to go about the Holy House. This led them at last to worship every stone that pleased their fancy; and their descendants, who forgot the earlier faith, abandoned the religion of Abraham and Ishmael and worshipped idols and fell into the errors of the people who had preceded them." The tradition is interesting as showing how easily historical theory exactly reverses the facts, and also as showing the Moslem's inability to comprehend the religion of his ancestors. But here it interests us especially as giving unbiassed testimony to the existence of stone worship before Islam.

The Kaaba is such a Beth-El. It is in fact called the House of God. But let us not be misled by this name, and by the fact that the Kaaba is a *building*, into supposing that it was a temple. The God resided in it only as Uzza resided in the tree which was identified with her. The four walls which constituted the original building were only an extension or enlargement of the sacred stone. No special emphasis was ever laid upon the room within these walls. The

* *Ibn Hisham*, Uebersetzt von Weil, I., p. 39.

walls themselves were the *sacrum*. And, when the roof was added, the building was a cube—simply an enlarged block. The black stone near one corner was most sacred, but the whole cube was an object of worship.* The *house* of the God was added in the curtain which was stretched over the structure, and which is still annually renewed. In all this—the sacredness of the stone, the cubical form of the sacred object, and the tent which was stretched over it—we see remarkable resemblances to Hebrew antiquity. Jacob's stone at Bethel has already been alluded to. But this is not the only sacred stone of Hebrew history. In Jacob's covenant with Laban we find another, and in fact the *Maççeba* appears to have been a regular accompaniment of the altar of Yahweh down to a comparatively late period.† We remember also that the Most Holy part in both Tabernacle and Temple was a cube in form; that over it was spread a tent in the desert; and that the central point even in the Temple of Solomon was a peculiar rock.

All these remarkable parallels are due to survival from early Semitic heathenism. Mohammed in his rejection of the idols should have rejected the Kaaba as well. Omar used to say, after the death of the Prophet, when he stroked the black stone of the Kaaba: "I know thou art only a stone and canst neither harm nor help; and had I not seen the Apostle of Allah do this I would never do it." But

* On other instances in which the sacred object was a building, cf. Wellhausen, *l. c.*, p. 39 f.

† Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 185 ff.

custom was too strong for logic. The reverence with which Mohammed had learned to regard the sanctuary in his youth clung to him in his manhood, and it carried the sanctuary and the Kibla into Islam. Various puritan sects have arisen in Islam which have tried to carry out the logic of the Prophet, to do away with the sacred stone, and to destroy the whole sanctuary. But the result has been only to establish the superstition the more strongly.*

The rites of the pilgrimage are also an instance of resemblance which is not dependence. They originate in Semitic heathenism, from which common source they passed over into Hebraism and into Islam. The pilgrimage is called by the name *haj*—the same word was used by the Hebrews for the yearly festivals.† The Arabic lexicographers define it as a *visit*. But it seems originally to have been the procession or dance around the sacred stone or the altar. A Psalmist speaks of going about the altar, and an-

* Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I., pp. 49, 60. The later tradition declares that Allah gave Adam a model of the Kaaba in curtains of light, pitching it on the spot on which the Kaaba now stands. This tradition is doubtless influenced by the Biblical account of the command given to Moses concerning the Tabernacle and the pattern which was showed him in the mount. Ex. 25⁴⁰. Cf. Prideaux, *Life of Mahomet*, p. 56. On the covering of the Kaaba in heathen times, Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I., 5. The theologians find a reason for kissing the black stone in the legend that it was originally a jewel from Paradise, which has become black by contact with sinful men. At the last day it will receive eyes and tongue and will bear witness for the believers.

It is interesting to note that the Heavenly Jerusalem is also a cube (Apoc. 21¹⁶).

† Exod. 12¹⁴, 23¹⁴, Lev. 23⁴¹ and often.

other was accustomed to lead the procession on festival occasions.* David danced before the ark. So we find in Arabia that the worshippers walk around the Kaaba and run between Safa and Merwa, two other sacred spots in Mecca.† The number of circuits is *seven*, ‡ which reminds us of the prominence of seven as a sacred number in Judaism. The theologians are ready with a theory that Adam was the originator of this custom, having seen the angels march about the throne of God in Paradise.

Other customs of the pilgrimage show notable analogies with those enjoined in the Old Testament, the analogies being due to their common heathen source. One of these is the shouting of the pilgrims. When the Haj reaches the sacred territory its members shout *Labbaika*—at Thy service! This shouting is called by a name derived from the root from which we find in the Bible *Hallelujah*. The *Hallelujah* also is a shout of greeting. The verb means *to shout* just like the corresponding Arabic verb. If the circuit of the sacred object was originally a dance, the shouting was the song that accompanied it. But all festivals are noisy occasions. So late as the time of the Psalms, worship is described as “shouting aloud to God.” § In the sacrificial ritual

* Ps. 26⁵, 42⁵.

† On the rites of the pilgrimage as now performed, cf. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina*. I have only the Tauchnitz edition (1874), in which the third volume is devoted to Mecca.

‡ Mohammed used to make three out of the seven with a quick step, the others more deliberately.—*Bochari*, II., p. 148.

§ Ps. 81². On the word *hallal* and its meaning, cf. Wellhausen,

both of Arabia and of Phenicia, the name of the God was shouted by the worshippers. The Arabic custom therefore was not borrowed (as Sprenger thinks), from Israel, but was a part of primitive Semitic worship which passed over into Israel and into Islam.

To our view the characteristic rite of the Hebrew religion was sacrifice, and this rite, as we know, is found in nearly all religions. In Arabic heathenism it existed in a very primitive form. The victim was not burned upon an altar—the blood was smeared on the sacred stone or poured out at its base. The application of the blood to the altar (or on the most sacred occasions to the Ark, the special seat of the divinity), continued in the Old Testament religion down to its latest development. In Islam, though the rite was retained,* the application of the blood to the sacred object (the Kaaba itself, of course, would have been the proper object), was lost. The meaning of sacrifice is therefore totally obscured. For we can hardly doubt that its early significance was in making the God partake of the feast, either by himself, or in the communion with the worshippers. In rejecting this idea, Mohammed was consistent with the general trend of his theology. God is, to him, supersensuous, and He cannot partake of food. On this the Koran has a very explicit declaration. The sacredness of the blood disappears—except that it cannot be eaten. There is no longer any idea either

Skizzen, III., p. 107; Sprenger, *Leben Muhammed's*, III., p. 527; W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 411.

* Cf. below, on the Service of God.

of expiation or communion connected with the rite. We should expect the rite to be done away. But it survives. Its merit is in fact emphasized, as is usually the case with unmeaning rites. But its merit is solely that it is obedience to a command of God.* It does not disprove Mohammed's independence of Judaism in this matter, that the theologians bring the great sacrifice at Mecca into connection with Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son.†

In connection with the pilgrimage we notice, as another survival, the shaving of the head. For Islam, it is assumed to be a part of the pilgrimage (Kor. 2¹⁹²). The references to it in Arabic heathenism are unambiguous,‡ and we see that the shorn hair is an offering to the God of the worshipper. In the Old Testament also the Nazarite shaved his head at the completion of his term of devotion, and the hair was burnt upon the altar. In Islam the rite now completes the pilgrimage, and its significance is apparently exhausted in marking the passage from the "holy" to the "common" state of life. This was true to a certain extent in Judaism, where shaving the head marked the accomplishment of any vow. The original sacrificial meaning still shows itself in another rite, which has survived in Islam and is en-

* The traditions on the merit of sacrifice are given by Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 552.

† Mohammed said (according to a tradition) that the sacrifices are conformable to the laws of Abraham.—Hughes, p. 552^b. The complete divorce of the rite from its early meaning is seen in the fact that the sacrifice of the Haj is offered in the valley of Mina—not at the Kaaba.

‡ Cf. Krehl, *Ueber die Religion der Vorislamischen Araber*, p. 14.

joined in tradition though not in the Koran. When a child is seven days old its head is shaved, and a goat is sacrificed, that is, slain, and the flesh distributed to the poor. We are expressly told that in heathenism the same custom prevailed, and that the blood of the slain animal was rubbed on the child's head.* This points to a dedication of the child to the God, and the shaving of the head must have had the same meaning. An analogue is circumcision, which also has survived in Islam though not enjoined in the Koran.

The list of customs which have survived from Semitic heathenism in both Hebraism and Islam is not yet complete. One of them is the changing of clothes by the pilgrim when he enters the sacred territory. This is not expressly enjoined upon Israel, but when they appear before God at Sinai, they are commanded to consecrate themselves and wash their clothes. The Psalmist exhorts to worship in "the beauty of holiness," by which he means vestments consecrated to the service. It is an expression of the same idea, when the priests are commanded to conduct their service in sacred garments. Ezekiel is especially clear, for he enjoins that when the priests go into the outer court to the people, they shall put off the garments in which they minister and put on others.† The same regulation passed into the priestly Tora. We cannot doubt that we have here a custom of Semitic heathenism which has survived into the later religions. In Israel it was

* Buraida, cited by Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 554.

† Ezek. 44¹².

specialized because a distinct order of priests was developed. Originally it was the whole people who were subject to this regulation. Islam has therefore more nearly preserved the original usage. We may note, in this connection, the law which forbids intercourse of the sexes during the pilgrimage—a law which has its counterpart in the Old Testament.*

The sacredness of a particular territory is one of the ideas originating in Semitic heathenism and surviving into the revealed religions. In his farewell pilgrimage, Mohammed said: "God consecrated this land in the day in which he made heaven and earth, and it is consecrated with His consecration until the day of resurrection. And killing was not lawful in it to any before me, and it was lawful to me for one hour of one day only. And it shall be consecrated with God's consecration until the day of Resurrection—its brambles shall not be cut, nor its game hunted, nor shall one pick up a lost article without advertising it, nor shall its fresh herbage be gathered."† This was simply the continuation of the heathen regulation. We find, besides Mecca, other sacred tracts mentioned in heathen times—*hima* is their name—within which animals could pasture at will and none could molest them. Not even stray animals could be reclaimed when they

* Kor. 2¹⁹³, cf. Ex. 19¹⁵. The priest at Nob refuses to give David the sacred bread until assured that the young men have kept themselves from women.—1 Sam. 21⁴.

† *Bochari*, II., p. 197. At the suggestion of Abbas, the Prophet made an exception in favor of the cutting of certain fragrant rushes; cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 134; Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, I., p. 23.

had once crossed the boundary of the *hima*. The land was sacred to the God who had his dwelling in it, and whatever came into contact with the land partook of the sacredness. It was not only the property of the God; it partook of his inviolability, so that whoever injured it was guilty of sacrilege. As we are not studying Arabic heathenism, we need not stop to inquire whether the earliest idea was that the God dwelt in the territory and therefore made it sacred, or whether it was the territory that was sacred, and therefore, the God dwelt in it. What interests us is that the primitive idea passed over into Judaism and Islam—and, indeed, into traditional Christianity. The sanctuary of God is a sanctuary for men—those in danger find an asylum there. Joab, when he knows his life to be threatened, flees to the altar and lays hold of it, and although in his case the asylum was not respected, this is the exception that proves the rule. The cities of refuge humanely provided in the later legislation for the protection of the manslayer, were doubtless originally seats of worship. The asylum has in them survived the sanctuary. It is not improbable that the provision for the cattle of the Levites in the “suburbs” of their cities is a relic of the same idea.* The Levites are consecrated persons. Their cities with the territory about them are sacred. The only cattle that can be allowed there must be the property of the sacred persons. It does not seem far-fetched to suppose that the Sabbatic year rests upon the same basis. The whole land of Israel belongs to Yahweh ;

* Num. 35².

His property in it is, therefore, shown by its being left uncultivated—the *hima* was always left in its natural state. To plough the *hima* is profanation. It was, of course, impossible to ordain that the land of Israel should be left uncultivated all the time, for its people had become cultivators. But the recognition of its sacredness might be made one year out of seven. This ordinance has had no influence on Islam; but the idea of holiness, or sacredness, which shows itself in Islam is evidently the same which appears in these various provisions of the Hebrew Law.

There are a number of heathen customs which have maintained their place in Islam, but which are tolerated rather than authorized. Sacred trees still have a sort of worship paid them. There are traces of such also in the Old Testament. It is, at least, a curious coincidence, that the tree of Uzza was an oracle, and that in Israel we have a *tree of the diviners*.* The worship of the dead has left traces in the customs of Israel and in the customs of Islam. The Jews builded the tombs of the prophets, and so do the Moslems to the present day.† With the sacred *fountains* at Kadesh and elsewhere, we may compare the sacred well Zemzem at Mecca, whose character was left undisturbed by Mohammed.

We shall have occasion to notice that the name of

* Judges 9³⁷. The coincidence is pointed out by Krehl, *Religion der Vorislam. Araber*, pp. 75, 78 f.

† Images of Abraham and Ishmael are said to have been worshipped in the Kaaba.—*Bochari*, II., p. 147. This is perhaps a deduction from the alleged foundation of the sanctuary by them. On saint-worship in Islam, cf. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II., p. 281 ff., and I., p. 229 ff.

God adopted by Mohammed is one of the names current in Arabia before his time, and that it is the same name used in Hebrew and Syriac. He had no need to borrow it from any other source than Arab custom. The name must have existed among the primitive Semites before the rise of the Hebrew religion.

The characteristic greeting of Islam is *Salaam* ! This is well known to be identical with the Hebrew *Peace* ! (*Shalom*.) Our first impulse is to derive Mohammed's custom from Judaism. But this would probably not be correct. In the desert the state of nature is a state of war, and every stranger is taken for an enemy. The most appropriate assurance when men meet is that *it is peace*. So we explain the custom in Hebraism, and we suppose the state of Arab society had given rise to the same custom in primitive times. The salutation would be a survival in both Judaism and Islam. The Meccans were accustomed to use another form ;* but this does not prove that Mohammed adopted his from the Jews.

The fact that the Arabic and the Hebrew are so closely related, and that the state of society in which the two languages were spoken was so nearly the same, causes a similarity in phraseology which may deceive us. We are likely to suppose there was borrowing, when, in fact, there was none. Or, again,

* According to Wakidi, Umair, who came from Mecca to Medina ostensibly to treat with Mohammed for the ransom of prisoners, used the salutation: "A Pleasant Morning;" Wellhausen, *Mohammed in Medina*, p. 75; cf. Goldziher in the Z. D. M. G., 46, p. 22.

there may have been borrowing before the time of Mohammed. In either of these cases it would be wrong to argue for Biblical influence on Mohammed, on the ground of resemblance. For example, the conjunction of riches and children as marks of prosperity is found in the Koran:* “Like those who were before you—they were more powerful than you and surpassed you *in riches and in children*.” This and similar expressions remind us of the Psalmist’s language: “Whose belly thou fillest with treasure, they are satisfied with children,” and other passages to the same intent. The resemblance is the more marked in that both Bible and Koran thus describe the wicked in their prosperity. But there is probably no dependence. It is the *Semitic idea* which puts large possessions and numerous offspring side by side as elements of good fortune. Another resemblance is found in the following:† “Those who deny Our signs [*or accuse Our verses of falsehood*] and show themselves proud against thee—for these the gates of heaven shall not be opened, nor shall they enter Paradise *until a camel shall enter the eye of a needle*.” In spite of the similarity to a well-known saying of the Gospel, it is probable that there is no direct influence to be assumed. The proverbial phrase was current before Mohammed (perhaps even before Christ), and Mohammed used it without any knowledge of the Gospel precedent. The same caution which is advisable in arguing from these cases is true of such resemblances in language as the following: “Every soul must *taste of death*.”‡ “God puts

* Koran 9⁷⁰, cf. Ps. 17¹⁴. † *Ibid.* 7³⁸, cf. Matt. 19²⁴. ‡ *Ibid.* 3¹⁸².

before you as a parable a man who is the slave of [two or more] incompatible masters, and the one who belongs to a single master—are they alike? ” * This readily suggests the assertion that it is impossible to serve God and mammon. Again, the comparison of those who hear and obey with those who hear but do not obey, seems to find an echo in the following: “Is he who has founded his walls upon the fear of God and His power better, or he who has founded his walls upon the edge of a crumbling precipice and falls with it into the fire of hell?” † With the Psalmist’s assertion that God derides the plotters against His Anointed, compare: “*God mocks at them*, and leaves them perplexed in their disobedience.” ‡ We must admit that in such passages there is always a possibility of Biblical influence. But the other possibility—that the resemblances are due to the other causes I have named—is constantly to be kept in mind. The strength of the argument to be based upon the resemblances depends somewhat upon the context of each particular passage. When we read in the account of Pharaoh, § that Moses said: “Your hearts became hard after this, and were like the rock or harder,” we suspect from the connection that Mohammed’s language is affected by Biblical influence. But in the other cases cited we are not warranted in assuming, as the cause of the resemblance, anything more than the general Semitic cast of thought and language in both Bible and Koran.

Before we leave this part of the subject it will be

* Koran 39³⁰, cf. Matt. 6²⁴.

† *Ibid.* 2¹⁴.

‡ *Ibid.* 9¹¹⁰, cf. Matt. 7²⁴⁻²⁷.

§ *Ibid.* 2⁵⁹.

legitimate to inquire what narrative material Mohammed took from Arabic heathenism. The Koran is a book nearly as large as the New Testament.* It would be difficult to fill so large a book with the simple dogmas and maxims of Islam. We are not surprised to find in it considerable narrative material. But very little of this material is drawn from Arabic sources—that is, from sources outside of Judaism and Christianity. Except two stories of some length there is nothing more than brief allusions. Among the brief allusions, I count what is said of Lokman the Sage.† For although this extends to ten verses, the verses are filled with a sermon of Mohammed's rather than with the story of Lokman. The verses throw no light upon the source of Mohammed's information, but it is evident that Lokman had already received in tradition a place among Arab heroes.

Scarcely more than an allusion is what is said concerning the army of the elephant. The event to which the account refers, is the destruction of the Abyssinians, which took place some forty years before the call of Mohammed—tradition dates it in the year of the Prophet's birth. The Abyssinians had a tributary kingdom in southern Arabia, and attempted to extend their power. In the vicinity of Mecca the army was compelled to halt, apparently by an epidemic of small-pox, by which, and by the Bedawin, it

* It contains about eighty-five per cent. of the number of words in the Arabic translation of the New Testament published by the Am. Bible Society.

† Koran 31¹¹⁻¹⁸. On the speculations of the commentators, cf. Maracci, *Refutationes*, p. 547.

was wholly destroyed. Mohammed's account, which is contained in one of his early suras, is as follows : *

“Dost thou not see how thy Lord wrought with the army
of the elephant ?

Did He not turn their cunning into confusion ?

And send upon them birds in companies,

Which threw upon them stones [like] graven seals,

And left them like stubble where cattle have grazed ? ”

Later writers have enriched the story with many details, none of which can be considered historical. The only historic fact we discover is that the army was defeated. Popular story ascribed their destruction to an army of birds which threw pebbles upon them. Whether the language—*graven seals*—implies that Mohammed believed the stones to be engraved with the names of those for whom they were destined is not certain. But it is evident that he was interested in the history solely for its religious bearing. A concern for history as history would have been unintelligible to him. What he valued was the illustration of the power of God.

He was moved by the same religious interest in selecting the two longer stories from Arabic history to which I referred above. These are the stories of Ad and Thamud which he uses a number of times. It is indeed almost an abuse of language to speak of these legends as history. Ad, described as a people of southern Arabia, may be wholly mythical. Thamud, on the other hand, is the name of a tribe which really

* Koran 105. The Abyssinian King rode an elephant, whence the title of his army.

existed. The feature of their civilization which stands out prominently in Mohammed's description, is that they make rock dwellings like those of Petra: "And ye hew the mountain into houses."* From the traditions of Mohammed's expedition to Tabuk, it seems quite certain that these "houses" are the rock tombs at Medain Salih, visited and described by Doughty.† They had probably been seen by Mohammed in one of his earlier journeys, for they lie on the caravan road from the Hejaz to Syria. The impression made upon his mind was very strong. A people once powerful enough to sculpture the mountains has disappeared by an act of God—this was the fact that was so startlingly told by these wonderful remains. This fact exactly suited his scheme of history. His was not the first religious mind to despise details and to construct history to fit a theory. In this case he filled in the bare outlines given by tradition with details suggested by his theory. Ad and Thamud are made to conform to the scheme already impressed upon him by the Biblical narratives. What this scheme is, is told us in his own words: ‡

"Have they not travelled in the land and seen the end of those who preceded them, though they were more numerous than they, and more powerful, and [though they] had more imposing monuments in the land? But what they had gained was of no avail. When Our Apostles brought them clear credentials, they rejoiced in what knowledge they [already] possessed; but that which they scoffed at came upon them. And when they saw the pain

* Koran 7¹².

† Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*.

‡ Koran 40⁸²⁻⁸⁵.

sent by Us, they said : We believe in God alone, and we disbelieve in what we [hitherto] associated with Him. But the faith which they professed when they saw the pain sent by Us, did not profit them. Such was God's method with those of His creatures who have passed away, and thus the unbelievers perished."

This is the philosophy of history according to Mohammed. It needs no argument to show that it is suggested by the Bible. What interests us here is that it is applied not only to the Bible stories, but also to the legends received from Arabic tradition. Like the Kaaba, the pilgrimage, the Kibla, the narrative material taken from heathenism was transformed by the new theology. The theology was strong enough to weld the apparently incongruous material into one system.

LECTURE III.

THE KORAN NARRATIVES

THE dependence of the Koran upon the Bible—whether the dependence be mediate or immediate we do not now inquire—is evident at a glance. There is not a page whose language does not remind us of the Old Testament or of the New. This is partly accounted for by the similarity of the Arabic language to the Hebrew, and also by the resemblance of the civilizations represented in the two books. As was noticed in the last lecture, not every verbal parallel can be taken as an evidence of dependence. To the examples there given we might add the following: We read in one instance a threat against evil-doers, which will be accomplished “though their cunning were such that mountains would be moved by it.”* We need not suppose a reminiscence of a New Testament phrase. The figure is natural to one who lives in a mountainous country. Again, the evil-doers are said to *devour the heritage of the orphan*.† The phrase is strikingly like some of those with which we are familiar in the New Testament, but it does not follow that it is borrowed from that source. So *those who expend their money in the sight of men*

* Koran 14⁴⁷.

† Ibid. 4¹¹, I cite the Koran always from Flügel's edition.

are strikingly like those who do alms *that they may be seen of men*,* but the phenomenon of ostentatious almsgiving is probably witnessed in all religions, and the identity of phenomena has produced the resemblance of language.

These reservations are not numerous or important. For considerable portions of the Koran we cannot be in doubt. Nearly all its narratives are Biblical stories. But in no case are they exact translations of the Biblical text. Quotations even of a single verse are not easy to find. The most diligent search does not discover more than two or three. The reasons for this are obvious. For one thing, there existed no Arabic translation of the Scriptures in the time of Mohammed. The Jews or Christians from whom he got his information were obliged to give the stories in their own words. But besides this, the Prophet evidently worked over the material he received, to fit it to his own purpose. He was not a historian, but a preacher. He used the history to convey a lesson. He may have had the idea that he could entertain his hearers and attract them by relating these histories. If so, he was disappointed. The Meccans openly preferred a reciter of fairy-stories who set up as his rival—perhaps a lesson to those who think the pulpit succeeds if it entertains its hearers. How far Mohammed indulged the hope of making his message attractive by putting it in the form of stories, it is not easy to say. For the most part the narratives were made strictly subordinate to his main purpose, and we can understand the nar-

* Koran 4⁴², cf. Matt. 6¹.

ratives only as we keep the purpose in mind. *To warn his hearers of the wrath to come*—this is his main aim, and this explains his choice of material, as well as the form in which the material is presented. As has already been remarked, this purpose is seen in his use of material from other than Biblical sources. The two histories which he takes from Arab antiquity are cast by him in Biblical form. As he tells them, both relate that a prophet was sent to his tribe. The tribe rejects the prophet and is punished. These brief sentences give the key to a large part of what we find in the Koran. His own experience is the light in which the author sees all history. The only proof necessary to adduce for this proposition is the choice of material.

The Old Testament stories used by Mohammed are those of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Joseph, and Moses. These are all from the Pentateuch, and some of them are repeated a number of times. The destruction of Sodom is given eight times, as is the account of the flood. The creation and fall of Adam are recounted five times, while there are no less than thirteen somewhat extended references to Abraham. It must be evident from this that the Pentateuch furnishes the largest part of the material borrowed for narrative purposes. From the rest of the Old Testament he takes Saul, David, and Solomon, and he has allusions to Elijah, Job, Jonah, and Gog and Magog. But none of these receives anything like the space given to the characters taken from the Pentateuch.

To illustrate what I have said of Mohammed's

motive and his method of treatment I will quote one of the accounts concerning Noah. It reads as follows : *

“ We sent Noah to his people [to say] : I am a plain-speaking warner, to tell you that you must not serve any but Allah. I fear for you the punishment of a distressing day. The chiefs of his people who disbelieved, said : We see that thou art nothing but a man like us, and we see that thy followers are only the basest of us, men of rash resolution. We do not discover that you are better than we—in fact we think you to be liars. He replied : O my people, if I have received a commission from my Lord, and He has given me a special grace which is unknown to you, do you think that I shall force it upon you when you are unwilling? O, my people, I do not ask riches—my reward depends on God alone, and I will not drive away those who have believed ; they shall meet their Lord. But I see you to be a people in ignorance. Moreover, O my people, who will be my helper against God if I drive these away? Will you not consider? I do not say that I have the treasures of God [at my command], and I do not know the secret things ; nor do I say that I am an angel, nor do I say [as you would have me] that God will not bring good to those whom your eyes despise—God knoweth what is in their hearts. In case I should do this thing I should be a wrong-doer. The chiefs replied : O, Noah, thou hast disputed persistently with us—bring now upon us what thou hast threatened, if thou art truthful ! He said : God alone can bring it upon you when He will, and you cannot thwart it. My advice will not profit you, if I wish to advise you, when God wills to lead you astray. He is your Lord and unto Him you shall be brought [at the last Day]. Do they say : He hath invented it [*i.e.*, his message]? If I have invented it, then the guilt of it rests upon me—but I am innocent of what you do. Then it was revealed to Noah : No more of

* Koran 11²⁷⁻⁵⁰.

thy people will believe than have believed already, but do not be distressed at what they do. Make an ark in Our sight and according to Our revelation and do not speak to Me concerning those who sin—they shall certainly be drowned. Then he made the ark, and whenever the chiefs of his people passed by, they scoffed at him. He said : If you scoff at us, we shall scoff at you as you are scoffing—then shall you know upon whom shall come a punishment that shall disgrace him, and upon whom an abiding punishment shall fall. [So they scoffed] until Our command came and the fountain broke forth.* We said : Place in it two of every kind, and thy family (except the one on whom the decree has passed) and those who have believed—but the believers were few. Noah said : Embark ! In the name of God shall be its sailing and its mooring ; my Lord is the Forgiving, the Compassionate. And it sailed with them on the mountain-like waves, and Noah called his son who stood aloof : My son ! come with us and be not of the unbelievers. He replied : I will betake myself to a mountain which will save me from the water. Noah said : Nothing to-day will save from the decree of God unless He take pity. Then the waves came between them and he was drowned. Then came the command : O, Earth, swallow up the water, and, O Heaven, cease [from rain] : and the water was diminished and the decree was carried out, and [the ark] rested on al-Judee,† and it was said : Away with the wrong-doers !

“Then Noah called to his Lord and said : My Lord, my son belonged to my family ; and Thy promise is true and Thou art the most just of judges.‡ God replied : O Noah, he was not of thy family. It were an unrighteous deed [to

* Literally, *until the oven boiled*. As the word which ordinarily means *oven* also means a *fountain* on occasion, there is no need to suppose Rabbinic or Persian influence.

† A mountain in Mesopotamia.

‡ Noah is pleading for his son, though he does not express his petition in so many words. God replies to the unspoken prayer, intimating that the son has cut himself off by his unbelief.

spare him], so do not ask of me that of which thou hast no knowledge; I warn thee lest thou be of the ignorant. Noah said: My Lord, I take refuge in Thee from asking that of which I have no knowledge; unless Thou forgive me and take pity on me I shall be lost. Then the command was given: O Noah, descend in peace from Us, and blessings upon thee and upon peoples yet to come from those with thee—but there are peoples whom We shall create, upon whom a grievous punishment shall come.”

You will agree with me that the Bible story is used in this passage only to furnish a framework for a sermon to Mohammed's contemporaries. The details of the story, those which in the Old Testament make it so realistic, are absent. We hear nothing of the wickedness of the sons of God in marrying daughters of men—which in Genesis gives a reason for the corruption of the earth. The violence, which is the specific sin mentioned there, does not appear in the Koran. We hear nothing of the size of the ark, or its material. The duration of the rain, the time of the subsidence of the waters, the sending out of the birds, the sacrifice at the end of the voyage, and the gift of the rainbow are all passed over in silence. On the other hand we hear an extended dialogue between Noah and his people, of which the Bible gives us no hint. One hint indeed we find which might give rise to this conception. It is contained in the New Testament where we find Noah described as a *herald of righteousness*.* It is this hint, as I suppose, which was worth more to Mohammed than all the Old Tes-

* II Pet. 2^d. The Christian tradition in the Apocalypse of Paul (Walker, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 1873, p. 491; *Antenicene Fathers*, 1836, Vol. VIII., p. 581), where Noah says: “I ceased not to

tament details. With this hint he reconstructed the history along the lines of his own experience. The sinfulness of the antediluvians now becomes idolatry. Noah is the Warner sent to turn them to the one God. In the dialogue we hear the voices of Mohammed and the Meccan aristocracy. As in the case of Mohammed, it is the aristocracy who oppose the preached word. Noah is told that only the lowest men hear him—just as at Mecca it was mostly slaves and freed-men who made up the infant church. Noah must hear that he is a man and not an angel—the implication being that he is not fit to be a divinely sent messenger. Such was one of the objections made to Mohammed. He is obliged to declare that he is not seeking earthly reward—an avowal elsewhere made by Mohammed for himself. He is urged to dismiss his followers; he refuses, and then is challenged to bring the threatened punishment. It is scarcely necessary to read between the lines to discover that Mohammed had just this experience. So far does this go that Mohammed really falls out of the *rôle* in one verse, where he replies to the accusation that he had invented his message. At least it sounds as if he had forgotten for the moment that he was personating Noah. In one of the parallel passages he shows a similar lack of historic imagination where the aristocracy of Noah's time are made to say to the people: "Do not abandon your Gods, do not abandon Wadd and Suwā', and Yaghuth and Ya'uk and

proclaim to men: Repent, for, behold, a deluge is coming; and no one paid heed, but all derided me." For Jewish tradition, Wünsche, *Midrasch Koheleth*, p. 130.

Nasr.”* But these false Gods are Gods of the Arab tribes who lived in the time of Mohammed. The commentators, who could not suppose their Prophet guilty of an anachronism, have had great difficulty in explaining how the Gods of Noah’s time survived the Flood and continued to be worshipped in Arabia.† The problem causes us no perplexity. We see how Mohammed identifies himself with his predecessor Noah so fully that he hardly distinguishes what is proper to each personage. It is an artistic fault. But it testifies to the religious earnestness of the man, that he cannot get out of his mind the idolatry which is the crying sin of his people.

In another verse Mohammed reveals to us something of his experience—I mean the one where God commands Noah not to be distressed at the small number of those who believed. He himself was no doubt often perplexed and grieved at the smallness of his following. In his perplexity he could only say that it was the will of God and therefore must be right.

So far, the story has been freely remodelled on the Biblical basis. But now we come to a feature which really contradicts the Biblical *data*. Noah is represented as having an unbelieving son. To this we may add that in another passage his wife is also represented as unbelieving and as perishing: “God sets forth as an example to those who disbelieve the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot; they were married to two of Our righteous servants, and were unfaithful to them—their husbands did not avail for them with God, and the

* Koran 71^{29f.}

† Cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, III., p. 11 ff.

command went forth : Enter the Fire with those who are entering therein." * These divergences show how freely Mohammed treats his sources. For the *preaching* of Noah and the scoffing of his contemporaries he had authority in Jewish or Christian tradition. But no one has yet pointed out a precedent for the particulars we are now considering. We are authorized in supposing that the preacher drew on his own experience for these as for other matters of detail. And we do not have far to seek for the experience. Doubtless there were families in Mecca which were divided—father against son. In fact, we hear of such in the traditions, and we know that Mohammed's own nearest relatives did not believe on him. It is not unlikely that he found here the only precedent he needed in order to suppose members of Noah's family unsaved in the great catastrophe.

The Biblical character which next claims our attention is Abraham, whose importance to Mohammed is greater than that of any other Biblical character. Whether he were already adopted in the legends of the heathen Arabs, as has been supposed, is very doubtful. Mohammed makes him the builder of the Kaaba, and therefore the founder of Mecca ; but this may be a construction of his own. The other incidents of Abraham's history given in the Koran are the following : He disputed with someone about the true God, and was the victor ; he prayed for evidence of the resurrection, and was commanded to cut four birds in pieces, to lay the pieces on separate hill-tops, and then to call the birds. On following out the di-

* Koran 66¹⁰.

rections, the pieces flew together and the birds were restored to life. He entertained the angels who were sent to destroy Sodom, received from them the promise of a son, and interceded for the preservation of Sodom, though without success. He refused to adore the idols of his father; for this he was thrown into the fire, but came out unharmed. He was driven from home by his father. He was commanded in a dream to sacrifice his son (whose name is not given), and was about to consummate the sacrifice when he was allowed to substitute an animal.* A point emphasized is that he was neither Jew nor Christian, but (if I may so say) a simple believer without the sectarian marks which distinguish, and therefore divide, these: "O People of Scripture! Why do you dispute concerning Abraham? The Tora and the Gospel were not revealed until after his time—do you not comprehend? Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian, but he was a *hanif*, he was resigned, and he was not one of the idolaters."† The word *hanif* has given rise to much speculation. For our present purpose it is enough to note that in the Koran it means *turning aside from idols*. It is the appropriate word to describe a man like Abraham who abandoned the false Gods and became a monotheist. It is this characteristic which makes Abraham of so much importance to Mohammed. He sees in him his predecessor and model. The Jews and the Christians had received revelations in written form—this is what he

* Koran 2280 ff, 1172 ff, 1571 ff, 5124-26, 2188 f, 3795, 1947, 37100 ff. Abraham is mentioned in twenty-six different suras

† Ibid. 358.61.

recognizes in calling them people of the Book. But the result had been to produce division and mutual recrimination. "The Jews (he says) say: The Christians have no firm foundation; and the Christians say: The Jews have no firm foundation. Yet they read the Scripture." * The only way to put an end to the disputes of these sects is to go back to the simple monotheism of Abraham. In this theory Mohammed was the pioneer of church union, and his is not the only attempt to unite two bodies of believers which has resulted in forming a third.

But this is aside from our main purpose. Mohammed regards Abraham as his model, and describes himself in the terms which he applies to Abraham: "Who has a more excellent religion than one who resigns himself to God while doing good works, and who follows the faith of Abraham as one who turns aside from idols [literally, *as a hanif*][†]—for God took Abraham as His friend;" "The nearest of men to Abraham are those who follow him, and this prophet [Mohammed] also is one of them."[†] In taking this position, Mohammed was only following the precedent set by the Apostle Paul. In justifying himself for giving up the Jewish Law, while still claiming to belong to the true seed of Abraham, Paul argued by the example of Abraham. It was conceded that Abraham was a true believer, the Father of the Faithful. But if this be so, religion cannot consist in the observance of the Law, for the Law came into force long after Abraham's death. For the true believer it must be enough to go back to the simplicity of Abra-

* Koran 2 07.

† Ibid. 4124, 361.

ham's religion. The argument of Mohammed is just the same, only he does not set it forth with the same array of logic. To the Jews who insisted that he must become a Jew in order to be saved, and to the Christians who insisted that he must become a Christian in order to be saved, Mohammed made the pertinent reply that Abraham lived the life of faith before the coming of either of their codes. The essentials of religion must consist in such faith as Abraham had, and this (according to his light) Mohammed adopted and preached. To him, just as truly as to Paul, Abraham was the Father of the Faithful.

How much direct New Testament influence led to this view of Abraham? In the meagreness of the sources we are not able to answer this question with positiveness. In general, Mohammed does not show much familiarity with the thought of the Apostle Paul. But I am inclined to think that some New Testament hint concerning the position of Abraham as the Father of Believers had come to him. It needs only a hint of that with which we are in sympathy to give us a flood of light. As showing that there was New Testament influence we may note that we find Mohammed calling Abraham the Friend of God—a point mentioned both in the Old Testament and in the New, but more distinctly brought out in the New.*

For other features of the Koran picture we must consult both Bible and tradition. Even then we discover that Mohammed dealt freely with his sources. The incident of the birds and the night covenant was

* Is. 41⁸; James 2²³.

unintelligible to him, as it doubtless is to many a Christian reader as well. But he could use it as a proof of the resurrection—something of which he felt the need in his preaching. He therefore transformed it into something quite different from the Biblical story. In regard to the dispute concerning the power of God, the Koran tells us only of an anonymous opponent who claimed to be the giver of life and of death—and therefore to be God. Abraham replied: My Lord makes the sun to rise in the East, do thou make it rise in the West?—whereat the infidel was put to confusion. In this story we have the tradition of Abraham's dispute with Nimrod, which was current among Jews and Christians before Mohammed's time. It was especially pat to Mohammed's purpose because it confounded the idolater.

Another legend current among both Jews and Christians was useful in the same line. It makes Terah, Abraham's father, to be a dealer in idols. One day Abraham was left in charge of the shop, and a woman came with an offering of food. Abraham set it before the largest idol, broke all the other idols and put a club in the hands of the large one. When his father asked about it he said: the idols quarrelled over the food; then the largest one became angry, took the club and broke the rest in pieces. Terah declared this to be impossible because the images could not move, whereupon Abraham convicted him out of his own mouth, which confessed him to be a worshipper of that which had no power. Nevertheless Abraham was brought before Nimrod and thrown into a fiery furnace, from which he was saved by a

miracle. Mohammed had no objection to taking a story from tradition rather than from the Biblical text—if indeed he knew the difference. That he took this one from a Christian source is indicated by the fact that he calls Abraham's father by the name *Azar*, which is quite similar to what we find in a Christian writer, though quite unlike the Hebrew Terah.* The Book of Jubilees, which circulated largely among both Jews and Christians, knows the story of Abraham's controversy with his father about the idols, so that there is no difficulty in attributing Mohammed's knowledge to Christian tradition.†

But it is clear that we cannot trace all the features of Mohammed's Abraham to preceding authorities, either Jewish or Christian. The main incidents came originally from the Bible—so much is evident. Some of the variations or additions can be accounted for on the theory that they are borrowed from Jewish or Christian sources outside the Bible. But others cannot be so accounted for, and can, in the

* *Athar* is the name of Abraham's father in Eusebius according to Sale, note on 6⁷⁴. He probably got his knowledge from Maracci, *Prodromus ad Refutationem Alcorani* (1698), Pars IV., p. 90, which is also cited by Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum Aufgenommen* (1833), p. 128. Maracci only says: *apud Eusebium in Historia Ecclesiastica*. The story of Abraham and the idols is found in *Midrasch Bereschith Rabba*, Uebersetzt von Wünsche, Par. 38 (p. 173). It is quoted also by Geiger, *l. c.*, p. 124. Among Christian authorities Jerome, *Questiones Hebraicæ in Genesim* (on Gen. 11²⁸), Op. ed. Vallarsius (1767), III., c. 323, cf. IV., c. 779, speaks of Abraham's being thrown into the fire.

† Ewald, *Jahrbücher*, III., p. 3. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge zur Semitischen Sagenkunde* (1893), p. 96, says that the story is also given by Ephraem Syrus.

present state of our knowledge, be attributed only to Mohammed himself, working under the belief that Abraham was for him a predecessor and a model.

As we have seen, Mohammed's scheme of history is writ large in these stories of former prophets. According to him, the past ages are a series of prophetic crises. In each one, a prophet has been sent to his people to warn them against sin. His usual experience is that his hearers refuse the message and mock or persecute him. Not long after, the calamity overtakes them and they perish. The prophet, with a few followers, is spared. In each of these cycles, the account is colored by Mohammed's own experience. Even the tribes of Arabia which have perished, have perished for the same reasons, and their prophets speak the language of rebuke and warning just like their brethren of the Biblical history. This constant iteration is one reason for the tediousness of the Koran. But a little reflection will show us that something of the same monotony is found in all preaching. The truths of religion are comparatively few and simple. The prophet is not infrequently accused of repeating himself. Even an Isaiah was mocked for bringing line upon line and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, as though he were teaching children just weaned from the milk. We shall not be surprised to find in the Koran the same lesson repeatedly enforced when we remember how long the prophet of Mecca addressed deaf ears and unbelieving hearts. The sameness of the lesson, whatever the particular incident which illustrates it, makes it unnecessary for us to go at length into all

the material. There is one character, however, to which we must devote a little time, and that is Moses.

From what has been said about Abraham, it is evident that Mohammed would have formulated his scheme of the world's history about as follows: There has always been in the world one true religion. This has been revealed without substantial variation to different prophets from Adam down: "[God] has established for you the religion which He commanded Noah, and that which We revealed to thee, and that which We commanded Abraham and Moses and Jesus, saying: Observe the true religion and do not be divided among yourselves."* When the Jews and Christians insisted on the confession of their faith as necessary for salvation, Mohammed instructed his followers to say: "We believe in God and in what has been revealed to us, and in what was revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the twelve tribes, and in what was given to Moses and to Jesus, and what was given to the prophets by their Lord. We make no difference between them and we are resigned to Him." The position could scarcely be stated more clearly, and the choice of Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus is a particularly happy one, and shows that Mohammed had really grasped the Biblical scheme—for these men stand at the opening of the great epochs of sacred history.

The name of Moses, the one to whom we now come, occurs in thirty-four suras of the Koran, and his history is given at length in a number of these.†

* 42¹¹, cf. 2¹³⁰.

† 2³⁸⁻¹⁰³, 7¹⁰¹⁻¹⁵⁴, 20⁸⁻⁹⁷, 26⁹⁻⁶⁶ are the most extended. Somewhat briefer are 27¹ ff, 28²⁻³⁸, 10⁷⁶⁻⁹².

The fact that it is given so many times should caution us against seeking the origin of the variations from the Biblical text in Rabbinical or Patristic sources. It is not likely that Mohammed received the account from an informant more than once. Having it once in his possession, he felt at liberty to treat it according to the varying exigencies of different times. The account which is earliest in point of time (to all appearance) is comparatively brief, and it shows that the Prophet was moved, as in all his earlier preaching, by the thought of God's judgment: "Has the story of Moses come to thee? When his Lord called him in the sacred valley of Tuwa [He said]: Go to Pharaoh the arrogant and say to him: Wilt thou become pure? I will guide thee to thy Lord, and thou shalt fear Him. Then he showed him a great miracle. But Pharaoh accused him of deceit and was rebellious. He turned his back, exciting disorder. Then he collected the people and said: I am your Lord most high! But God destroyed him with the punishments of this world and of the world to come. Verily this is a warning to him that fears God." * For the purpose of the speaker this is an admirable epitome of the story of Moses. It shows just the points which Mohammed wished to emphasize, that is: those parallel with his own case. Even here he does not adhere strictly to the Biblical account, for we nowhere read that Pharaoh claimed to be God. This is borrowed evidently from Mohammed's informant, and the same feature is found in fact in Jewish authorities.

In the more extended accounts which Mohammed elsewhere gives, we find details taken from Christian as well as Jewish sources, besides some which are due to the narrator's own imagination. From Jewish tradition he asserts: that Moses refused all Egyptian nurses; that the people at Mount Sinai demanded to see God, and on seeing Him fell dead, but were revived by divine power; and that they refused to accept the covenant until the mountain was lifted up bodily and held over them.* The information that the golden calf, through the magic of its maker, *bellowed*, is found in Rabbinical sources, and a similar affirmation is made of another golden calf in a Christian writer of the tenth century.† Mohammed makes the magicians of Pharaoh repent and confess the true God. This is perhaps a legitimate deduction from the Old Testament account, in which they are said to recognize the finger of God.‡ No Jewish document has been found which makes the deduction, but we know of a Christian apocryphon, now lost, which was entitled: *Liber Pœnitentiæ Jamnæ et Mambreæ*. Jamnes and Mambres, I hardly need say, are the traditional names of the magicians.§ We are justified, therefore, in supposing this item borrowed from a Christian source.

There remain a number of data which are due to

* 28¹¹, 253⁶⁰, 71⁷⁰.

† 71⁴⁶, 20⁹⁰. On the Rabbinical authorities cf. Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed*, etc., pp. 155-172. The lowing of the golden calf at Gilgal on the day of Elisha's birth is spoken of in the *Book of the Bee*, Budge's translation, p. 70.

‡ Ex. 8¹⁵, English version 8¹⁹; Koran 20⁷² ff.

§ II. Tim. 3², cf. Dillmann in P. R. E.², XII., p. 365.

Mohammed's own imagination, or which simply witness to his ignorance of the Bible account. Thus : he gives the plagues at one time as five and again as nine in number ; * he makes Haman one of the counsellors of Pharaoh ; † he supposes the buildings of Pharaoh to have been destroyed, and that the murderers against Moses returned to Egypt ; ‡ yet, in another passage, he seems to affirm that Israel possessed the country of Pharaoh after him. § That Moses repented of having killed the Egyptian is a minor addition which we can easily account for, and it is not a serious error that Pharaoh's wife is made to care for Moses, instead of his daughter. || Confusion of Moses with Jacob is the evident cause of the assertion that Moses served eight years for a wife, and a similar confusion of Egypt with Babylon shows itself when Pharaoh orders the people to make brick : " that I may make a lofty building, so as to become acquainted with the God of Moses—though, indeed, I think him to be a liar." ¶

Almost all these departures from the Biblical narrative occur in late chapters, and they show what has already been remarked, that as time went on, the preacher became less careful (if, indeed, he ever was careful) of historical accuracy, and adapted his material more freely to the purpose in hand. In the use of this material we can see the influence of his own changed circumstances. Few characters in history have experienced a greater change of fortune than fell to the lot of Mohammed in going from

* 7¹³⁰, 17¹⁰³.

§ 26^{57, 59}.

† 28³⁸.

|| 28⁸, 14 ^f.

‡ 7¹³³, 25⁸.

¶ 28²⁷, 38.

Mecca to Medina. At Mecca he was the proscribed preacher of a new religion. His followers were few in number, and the majority of these had fled to Abyssinia. His persecution by the leading men of the city took away from him every occupation of a secular nature. Even the public proclamation of his message was forbidden after a time. All that was open to him was meditation, prayer, and the encouragement of a very narrow circle of friends. With the removal to Medina all this was changed. The cares of administration were thrust upon him. His life became a life of activity instead of contemplation, and his sermons necessarily dealt with the concrete issues of the hour.

The reason for calling attention to this fact at just this point is that one of the longer histories of Moses in the Koran can be understood only from this situation of the Prophet. It is really a polemic against the Jews. We have reason to believe that Mohammed came to Medina with great expectations, based on the fact that a considerable part of the population was Jewish. He sincerely believed his religion to be the same as theirs. He was sure that he was the legitimate successor of their prophets. What would be more natural than that they should join his community, or at least that his followers and they should unite on a common basis of recognition? With this idea he made Jerusalem his *Kibla*, and assimilated his doctrine to theirs. But he was speedily undeceived. The Jews were wholly guided by their Rabbis, who had no mind to a prophet born out of Palestine. They refused to see the marks of their

expected Messiah in the Meccan adventurer. They were, moreover, conscious of their intellectual superiority. They had studied the sacred Books which were in their hands. Mohammed conceded the authority of these Books, but he was only slightly acquainted with their contents. In arguing from them the Jews had an evident advantage, and often put the Moslems to silence. At last Mohammed was obliged to forbid his followers to argue with the Jews, and he accused these of concealing portions of their revelation.

This certainly could not conduce to harmony, and Mohammed early realized that he had to deal with men less open to conviction than the heathen. The Jews, on their part, did not see the danger of trifling with a man who was in dead earnest, and who now had the sword in his hand. Their more instructed men would lay traps for Mohammed in their talks with him, and when he betrayed his ignorance, as he would naturally betray it in such circumstances, they would go away and in their own circle make merry over his laughable blunders. Arab satire travels fast, it travels far, and it bites hard. We can easily conceive the situation of a prophet in a mixed community, ridiculed in couplets that were in the mouths of all who were hostile or who were lukewarm. The insults were the harder to bear in that they were directed against beliefs which had become sacred to him. They seemed to him blasphemies against the Holy Ghost and he never forgave them. The expatriation of one Jewish tribe, and the extermination of another, were only part of his answer.

It was before the open breach came that the following review of the history of Israel was delivered :

“O Children of Israel ! Remember My grace which I conferred upon you [when I said]: Keep the covenant with Me and I will keep the covenant with you ; and fear Me and believe in what I have revealed in confirmation of what you already possess,* and be not the first to disbelieve. And do not sell My wonders for a small price,† but fear Me. Do not cover up the truth with falsehood, nor conceal the truth which you know.‡ But observe prayer and give alms and bow with those who bow down. Will you command men good actions but forget them yourselves?§ Yet you read the Scriptures ; do you not comprehend ? Practise therefore patience and prayer—this is difficult except for the humble, who are mindful that one day they must meet their Lord and that they are to return to Him.

“O, Children of Israel ! Remember My grace which I have conferred upon you, in that I have distinguished you above the worlds ; and fear the day when one soul shall not pay the debt of another, nor shall its intercession be received nor a ransom be accepted nor aid be given. And [remember] when We saved you from the tribe of Pharaoh who inflicted upon you a grievous calamity in that they slew your sons while they preserved alive your daughters (this was a severe trial from your Lord) ; and when We divided the sea for you and delivered you, but drowned the host of Pharaoh while you looked on. But when We gave the promises

* That is, the Scriptures.

† An accusation elsewhere made against the Jews, reminding us of Paul’s charge that the idolaters exchange the truth of God for a lie. Possibly Mohammed thought the Jewish scribes forged verses which they sold as Biblical.

‡ This means : the Jews deny that their Scriptures contain what Mohammed says they contain.

§ Paul also accuses the Jews of teaching the Law to others, at the same time violating it themselves, Rom. 2.

to Moses forty nights, then you took the calf in his absence and transgressed. Yet We forgave you, thinking perhaps you would be grateful. We gave Moses the Book and the Distinction,* that you might be rightly led; and Moses said to his people : O, my people ! you have wronged your own souls in taking the calf ; repent in presence of your Creator or else kill each other †—this were better for you with Him—He will forgive you, He is the Forgiving, the Compassionate. And when you said : O, Moses, we will not believe in thee unless we see God clearly, the thunderbolt struck you while you gazed, but We brought you to life after you had died, thinking perhaps you would be grateful. And We shaded you with the cloud ‡ and sent you the manna and the quails, saying : Eat of the good things with which We nourish you (they did not harm Us but it was their own souls that they harmed). And when We said: Enter this city and eat of it abundantly whenever you choose, but enter the gate bowing down and asking forgiveness—We will forgive your sins and will certainly prosper those who do well—then the evil-doers substituted a word different from the one which was commanded them, and we sent upon the evil-doers a pestilence for their iniquity. And when Moses asked water for his people, We said : Strike the rock with thy staff; and there broke from it twelve fountains, every one knew his drinking place [and We said]: Eat and drink of the sustenance given by God, and do not deal unjustly in the earth, creating disorder. And when you said : O, Moses, we cannot bear this one kind of food, ask of thy Lord that He bring forth for us of the

* The book which distinguishes between right and wrong. Possibly Mohammed thinks of the Mosaic tradition (the Mishna) which expounds the regulations of the Law more exactly.

† Or, *Kill yourselves*. The sense is obscure. The Arab commentator makes it mean *mortify your lusts*, but that is hardly Mohammed's intention. I suspect a reminiscence of the fact that the Levites fell upon the idolatrous people and slew them.

‡ Evidently the pillar of cloud.

fruits of the earth, vegetables and cucumbers, and garlic and lentils, and onions, he said : Will you prefer the worse to the better ? Return to Egypt and you shall have what you ask. And they were smitten with abasement and poverty and returned with the anger of God upon them. This was because they disbelieved in the signs of God and killed the prophets wrongfully; this it was in which they rebelled and transgressed. Those who believe, though they be Jews or Christians or Sabeans—whoever believes in God and the Last Day, and does good, receives a reward from his Lord. Fear shall not come upon them nor shall they be grieved.

“ And when We made a covenant with you and lifted the mountain above you, saying : Receive with steadfastness what We have brought you and remember what it contains—perchance you will be God-fearing—then you turned back ; and had not the grace of God been upon you and His mercy, you would have been lost. You know who of you transgressed the Sabbath, and We said to them : Become abhorred apes ! Thus We made them an example to their fellows, and to those who should come after them and a warning to those who feared God. And when Moses said to his people : God commands you to sacrifice a heifer ; they replied : Art thou making a mock of us ? He said : I take refuge in God from being one of the ignorant ! Then they said : Pray thy Lord for us that He would explain to us what sort of a heifer it should be. Moses replied : She is to be neither old nor young, but of a medium age, therefore do what you are commanded ! They said : Pray thy Lord to tell us plainly of what color she should be. He replied : It is commanded that she should be of a bright red, a color which pleases the beholder. Then they said : Pray thy Lord to describe her plainly to us—we have cattle that look alike, and we would be guided if God please. Moses replied : It is commanded that she be not broken to till the ground or to water the fields, sound,* and without spot. They said : Now thou bringest a true

* Not approached by the male.

message. So they sacrificed her, but they were near not doing it. And when you killed a man, and quarrelled concerning the deed (but God brought to light what you were concealing), then We said: Touch the dead man with a part of the heifer; thus God brings to life the dead, and shows you His signs—perchance you will comprehend.* But even after this your hearts were hard, even like rock or harder, for there are rocks from which streams spring, and there are those which open and let the water flow; and there are [hearts] which bow in fear of God, and God is not unmindful of what you do.”†

When we read this tremendous indictment we see that the Biblical facts are used for a purpose. And they are used with skill. The Jews could not deny the most of the facts here recited. They were guilty, or at least their fathers were guilty—as charged. The position of Mohammed is precisely the position of the New Testament, as shown in the speech of Stephen. Mohammed had no such orderly knowledge of the history as Stephen had, but he uses what knowledge he had in just the way in which Stephen used his. The climax of Stephen’s discourse is the real burden of Mohammed’s: “Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears! Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did so do ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute . . . ye who received the Law as it was ordained by angels and kept it not!” Whether there was some knowledge of the New Testament position on Mohammed’s part we cannot certainly say. As a case

* The implication is that the murdered man was raised to life long enough to testify against his murderer.

† 2^{39, 69}.

of history repeating itself, the parallel is certainly interesting and instructive. The similarity extends further than the two discourses. In each case the discourse showed that the breach was at hand. The Jews could not deny the guilt charged by Mohammed or by Stephen. It did not follow that they would be converted. The divergence was already hopeless.*

Turning now to the New Testament, we discover that only two of its histories are known to Moham-

* For the sake of completeness, we may notice that Mohammed has some other incidents not yet traced to their original. He knows of a time when the Children of Israel were commanded to enter a city in a certain way, but they changed the word which was commanded. The Mohammedan commentators say that out of wantonness they went in in an indecent posture and instead of saying *hitta* (forgiveness) they said *hubba*, a grain of corn. For this they were punished, apparently with a pestilence. This is simply a conjecture on the basis of the Koran text. I am inclined to see in the passage the incident of the spies. The people were commanded to enter the land (the distinction between land and city is easily lost) and to act righteously there. The spies *substituted* their evil report *for the command* of God. The people then, having first refused to go, insisted upon going wilfully and were smitten. The resemblances are not very marked, but the Biblical story might give rise to what we find in the Koran. (This identification is not original with me.)

Again we have the story of the violators of the Sabbath who were changed into apes. The only Rabbinical parallel yet pointed out is the Midrash that a part of the people of the Tower of Babel were changed into apes, demons, and evil spirits. Cf. *Hirschfeld, Jüdische Elemente im Koran* (1878), p. 65, who cites Talmud, Sanhedrin 109 a. Possibly the Arabs in Medina had turned this story against the Jews before the coming of Mohammed. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the narrative of the red heifer has mixed two Mosaic ordinances—the sacrifice of the red heifer in the Book of Numbers (chap. 19) and the Deuteronomic enactment (chap. 21) that a heifer should be slain to atone for a murder the author of which is unknown.

med. These are the history of John the Baptist, and the life of Jesus. John is a prophet, and, like the other prophets, receives a book, that is, a revelation.* Zachariah, his father, is also once mentioned in the list of prophets. Elsewhere he comes in incidentally, in connection with the birth of his son. Zachariah's prayer and its answer are recounted somewhat at length, following in the main the narrative of Luke. John is a prophet entirely after the pattern of those already known to us from the Old Testament.†

Concerning Jesus, the first fact that we meet is that he is not mentioned in the earliest group of suras. But as very few Biblical characters are mentioned in this period, the fact may have no special significance. Mohammed's thought at this time was much upon the approaching judgment. The few histories to which he alludes are those which enforce the lesson of God's chastisement, the destruction of Sodom, the overthrow of Pharaoh, the judgments on Ad and Thamud, the catastrophe of the Lord of the Elephant. These are almost the only events to which he alludes. The life of Jesus presents no feature which would bring it into relation with these events, so that although there are distinctively Christian

* 19¹³, 3³⁴.

† It may be, as supposed by Sprenger (*Leben Muhammed's*, II., 184), that Mohammed thought John the founder of the sect of the Sabæans (or Mandæans). But this is not proved by the fact that he describes John as receiving a book. He conceives that all the prophets receive sacred books: "If they accuse thee of falsehood [remember that] the apostles before thee were accused of falsehood, they who brought signs and Psalms and an enlightening Book," 3¹⁸¹.

features in these early revelations, they present no natural opening for a life of Jesus.

Again: it is noticeable that Jesus is nearly always mentioned in connection with Mary. It almost seems as if Mohammed were more impressed with Mary than with Jesus: " [Remember] her who kept her virginity, and We made her and her son a sign for the worlds" is said in one of the earliest passages in which either one is mentioned.* In another, of the same period, Mohammed gives an account of the Annunciation and of the birth of Jesus without mentioning him otherwise than as *the infant*,† until at the close, apparently as an afterthought, he adds: " This [that is, the infant] is Jesus, son of Mary, the Word of Truth, concerning whom they are in doubt." ‡ Still another reference of this period is the following: " And We made the son of Mary and his mother a sign, and We gave them an asylum in a lofty place, still and well-watered."§ We can hardly be mistaken in finding here a reference to the Revelation of John, where the woman who gives birth to the man child, flees into the wilderness where " she has a place prepared of God that they may nourish her." Perhaps this passage of the Revelation was already brought into connection with the Flight into Egypt. In any case, up to this point there is no indication of the pre-eminence of Jesus, but rather a tendency to hold up Mary as the chief character. A further evidence

* 21⁹¹.

† 19¹⁶⁻³⁴.

‡ This translation makes a slight change in the pointing. I suppose the sense to be the same as in 4¹³⁹.

§ 23⁵², cf. Rev. 12¹⁻⁶.

of this is the space given to the life of Mary. In relating this, Mohammed draws from sources outside the Canon. His own property we can see only in his calling her the daughter of Imran and the sister of Aaron*—doubtless a confusion of Mary with Miriam, the names being identical in Arabic.

Concerning her, we hear that she was dedicated by her parents to the service of God, and thus came into the care of Zacharias, to whom she was assigned by the sacred lot.† She resides in the Temple, where she is fed by the angels. She is visited by the angel, who announces that she is to become the mother of Jesus. A spring of water breaks forth at her feet and a palm-tree supplies her with dates. The infant Jesus speaks to vindicate his mother.‡ The most of these details can be identified in the Apocryphal Gospels which have come down to us. According to these, Mary was dedicated to God by her parents when three years old and taken to live in the Temple. There she was fed by the angels. When fourteen years old she was assigned to Joseph, from whose rod there came forth a dove. In her need, a palm bends down to supply her with dates and a spring flows at her feet.§ We do not find in any of these sources

* 19²⁰.

† "Thou wast not among them when they threw their reeds to see which of them should care for Mary, nor wert thou with them when they disputed," 3⁵⁹.

‡ The main references are 3³⁰⁻⁵², 19¹⁶⁻⁵⁴.

§ These incidents are narrated in the various Apocryphal Gospels, cf. the volume in the *Antenicens Christian Library* containing translations of these by Walker, American edition of the *Antenicens Fathers*, Vol. VIII. Some of them are also found in the *Book of the Bee*, translated by Budge.

that Jesus speaks immediately after his birth, but a similar incident is narrated in a Syriac Christian source,* by which (indirectly) Mohammed was possibly influenced.

The prominence of extra canonical sources seen in the life of Mary is less marked in the life of Jesus. When we are told, however, that he made birds of clay and that when he blew upon them they became alive, we remember the similar account in the Apocryphal Gospels. Mohammed has also an extended account of Jesus bringing a table with food from heaven for his disciples. On the face of it, this seems to be derived from the institution of the Supper, with reminiscences of Peter's vision at Joppa. We hear in general of Jesus's miracles, that he healed a man blind from his birth, and a leper, and that he raised a dead man to life. Beyond this, Jesus is affirmed to be a prophet, the Word of God and His Spirit, and one who received a Book of revelations.

Mohammed was compelled to define his position in regard to Jesus, first by the assertions of the Meccans and then by the claims of the Jews. We know of the dilemma proposed by the Meccans from the following passage : †

“ And when the son of Mary is proposed as a likeness, then thy people turn their backs to him and say : Are our gods better, or is he ? They say this only out of contention, and verily they are a contentious people. In truth he was only a servant on whom We bestowed Our grace, and We made him an example to the Children of Israel. (If We had

* The Life of Ephraem contained in Uhlemann's *Syrische Chrestomathie* gives a similar incident.

† 43⁵⁷⁻⁶⁵.

willed, We would have produced from you angels to succeed you in the earth.) And he is a sign of the [approach of the] Hour.* Therefore do not dispute concerning this but follow—this is the straight path—and let not Satan turn you away; he is your declared enemy. When Jesus brought signs and wonders he said: I bring you true wisdom, and I will make plain to you a part of that concerning which you dispute; fear God and obey. God is my Lord and your Lord, therefore serve Him—this is the straight path. But the sects disputed among themselves. Woe to those who do evil; for them is the punishment of a day of torture.”

The most natural interpretation of this passage is the one suggested by the commentators. Mohammed had threatened that the idolators should be cast into hell and with them their false gods. The Meccans knew enough of Christianity to say that Jesus also was an object of worship. They therefore held up the dilemma—either all objects of worship besides Allah were *not* cast into hell, or else Jesus, whom Mohammed held up as an example, must go with them. In either case Mohammed had spoken falsely. This is the meaning of their question whether Jesus was better than their gods.

The reply is, in effect, that Jesus was only a man like the other prophets, and that he himself called men to the worship of the one God. As to his alleged divinity, not all even of the Christians are agreed about it, and in the difference of opinion it is best to adhere to that of which we are fully convinced, namely: that there is but one God, and that Jesus was an Apostle like Abraham and Moses, but not worthy of higher honor than they.

* Jesus's second coming will precede the judgment.

The temptation at Medina was of another sort. There Mohammed was trying to win the Jews, to whom Jesus was an abomination. It would have been one obstacle removed if he could have taken Jesus out of the company of Abraham and Moses. But Mohammed was firm in the position once taken. While still denying the divinity of Jesus, he reaffirmed his Apostleship. The following are all from Medinan suras:

“And Jesus the son of Mary, said to his people : O, Children of Israel! I am the Apostle of God to you, testifying to the truth of what you have already received in the Tora, and bringing you tidings of an Apostle to come after me whose name is Ahmed. But when he showed them miracles they said : This is evident magic.” *

“Then [after Noah and Abraham] We sent Jesus the son of Mary, and We gave him the Gospel, and We placed in the hearts of those who followed him, tenderness and compassion.” †

“[The Day when God assembles the Apostles] He will say: O, Jesus, Son of Mary! Remember My grace bestowed upon thee and thy Mother, when I strengthened thee with the Spirit of Holiness, that thou shouldst speak to men when in the cradle and when full grown. And I taught thee the Book and the Wisdom and the Tora and the Gospel.” †

This passage is followed by an account of the miracles ; other passages of this period also affirm that Jesus performed miracles, that he received the Holy Spirit, and that he was an Apostle sent with a Book.

Mohammed adhered therefore to the position once taken. But with the same persistency he refused to

* 61⁶.

† 57²⁷.

‡ 51⁰⁹.

go further and acknowledge that Jesus was more than a prophet. The knowledge that the Christians affirmed a Trinity in the Godhead found no response in his heart except one of denial. We can scarcely wonder at this. The knowledge seems not to have come to him until his system was settled in his own mind. His mind was unschooled in theological definition and could apprehend the doctrine only as Tritheism, and therefore as a modification of the polytheism which he was opposing. Some have indeed found a Trinitarian tendency in his adoption of the name Rahman for God. But this is unlikely, for the vigor with which he rejected the Christian doctrine is evident. The following passages cannot leave any doubt in our minds:

“The Jews say : Ezra is the son of God ; and the Christians say : The Messiah, Son of Mary, is the son of God. This word of theirs in their mouths is like the word of those who were unbelieving in old time. God has declared war against them. Why should they lie?” *

“They are unbelievers who say that the Messiah, the son of Mary, is God. The Messiah said [on the contrary] : O, Children of Israel, serve God, my Lord and your Lord ; whoever associates anything with God [as an object of worship], God has shut Paradise against him, and his abode is the Fire, and the evildoers have no helper. They are unbelievers who say : God is one of three. There is no God but One, and if they do not cease saying this a painful punishment shall overtake the unbelievers. . . . The Messiah, Son of Mary, was only an Apostle who was preceded by other Apostles. His mother also was truthful [and would not permit such an assertion]. They were both accustomed to eat [mortal] food.” †

* 9:30.

† 5:76, 79.

“O, ye who possess the Scriptures! Be not extravagant in your religion, and do not say concerning God anything but the truth. The Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, was the Apostle of God and His Word which He communicated to Mary, and a spirit from Him. Believe therefore in God and His Apostles and do not say: Three! Cease doing it, that will be better for you. One God alone is God. Far be it from Him that He should have a son! To Him belongs what is in heaven and what is on earth—and God suffices us as an administrator. The Messiah, Son of Mary, did not disdain to be a servant to God, nor do the angels who draw near to him.”*

These passages, with others, show the sharp recoil in the Prophet's mind from the doctrine of the Trinity. But we should remember that the Trinity, as he supposed the Christians to teach it, was made up of Father, Son, and Mary. Thus only can we interpret his constant association of Mary and Jesus, and his very sparing mention of the Holy Spirit. Among the Christian sects of the East, Mary was early lifted to the throne of heaven. “Her cultus is [still] equally in vogue among orthodox and heretics.”† It was in Arabia that the Collyridians invested her with the name and honors of a goddess.‡ This reflection throws light upon a passage of the Koran where God is represented as saying to Jesus at the Last Day: “O, Jesus, Son of Mary! didst thou say to men: take me *and my mother* as gods besides Allah? He will reply: Far be it! It does not belong to me to say

* 4¹⁶⁹.

† Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der Vergleichende Confessions-Kunde* (1892), I., p. 464.

‡ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Chapter L. Cf. Sale, Preliminary Discourse, § II.

what is not true. Thou knowest whether I have said it. Thou knowest what is in my soul." * This passage seems to show conclusively that Mohammed conceived of the Christian Trinity as made up of Allah, Mary, and Jesus.

Now such a Trinity would seem the more distinctly heathen to him, because the heathen also related their gods in families. The Meccans had a considerable pantheon. The question of the relationship existing between its members had probably already occurred to them. If not, it was forced upon them by Mohammed's claim that two Gods could not coexist without war. The natural theory, as we see in other polytheistic religions, is that the gods make a family. Not only was this the theory of the Meccans, it was a point at which Mohammed at one time made concessions to them, though he afterward retracted. This experience made him more than ever determined to maintain the absolute unity of God. A number of passages which deny that God has children are directed primarily against the Meccan doctrine. It is probably so with the early profession of faith: "God is One; the self-existent God; He begets not and is not begotten; and nothing is to be likened to Him." And again: "He it is to whom belongs the kingdom of heaven and of earth, and He has not taken any as son, nor has He an associate in the kingdom. He created all things, and determined them by His decree; yet they take as gods besides Him things which do not create, but are themselves created." † And once more: "They say: The Compassionate has a son. Far be it from

* 5¹¹⁶.

† Sura 112, and 25^{2,3}.

Him. Nay, these are honored servants. They do not anticipate Him in speaking, and they perform His commands. He knows what is before and what is behind them, and they can intercede only so far as He gives permission, and they tremble with fear of Him. Should one of them say: I am a God besides Him—such an one We will reward with Gehenna. Thus we reward the evildoers.”* It is abundantly evident that this is directed against the gods of the Meccans. But having taken this position in regard to the daughters of God, as they called their goddesses, no way was open to him to acknowledge the sonship of Christ. In truth, he shows no desire to recognize it, and in one place goes so far as to say that, at the affirmation that God has a son, the heavens are ready to be rent in twain, the earth to cleave asunder, and the mountains to fall into ruin.†

One thing more must be noticed in this connection. In regard to the death of Jesus, Mohammed took what is known as the Doketic position. His language is this: “They [that is, the Jews] say: We slew the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, the Apostle of God.‡ But they did not slay him, and they did not crucify him, but a likeness was presented to them, and they who disputed concerning him were in doubt—they had no certain knowledge, but followed an opinion. They did not kill him in reality; God raised him to Himself. God is almighty and wise.

* 21²⁶⁻³⁰.

† 19⁹² f.

‡ Of course the Jews would not call him either the Messiah or the Apostle of God. Mohammed gives the sense of their claim as it lay in his mind.

There are none of the people of the Scriptures who will not believe on him before their death, and in the day of resurrection he will be a witness against them." * It is clear from this language that the doctrine adopted by Mohammed came from those Gnostic sects which denied that Jesus was really crucified, holding that Judas was substituted for him, and nailed to the cross, while Jesus ascended directly to heaven. † The variations of this view held by the different sects do not here concern us. What interests us is the motive of Mohammed in adopting it, as he did, at a comparatively late date. In earlier chapters he alludes to the death of Jesus in the same terms which he employs in speaking of the other prophets. ‡

It is perhaps significant that Mohammed so often reproaches the people of the Scriptures with their differences and disputes. He had primarily in mind, we may suppose, the disputes between Jews and Christians. But it is not unlikely that he also knew of the differences between the Christian sects. If so we may conclude that he had become aware of the different views of the death of Jesus, and that he was compelled to choose between them. The motive in adopting the one on which he finally settled was furnished by the Jews at Medina. The passage before us shows that the Jews taunted him with the claim that they had put to death one of the Apostles whom he claimed as a predecessor. § Now, in his general

* 4¹⁵⁶ f.

† Cf. Herzog, *P.R.E.*², IX., p. 247.

‡ 19¹⁵.

§ An interesting parallel is found in the language used by the Jewish King Dhu Nowas to the Christian inhabitants of Nagrah: "The Greeks know that our fathers, who were priests and Pharisees

scheme, Mohammed found no room for the early death of a prophet. In the cases already discussed, the prophet was uniformly delivered, while the *unbelievers* were destroyed. The life of Jesus as it is given in the Gospels does not conform to this scheme. The theory that Jesus *offered himself* for His people did not commend itself to him if he ever heard of it, nor would it really answer the argument of the Jews. The relief sought was found in the Dokeric doctrine, which was therefore adopted. In this way the life of Jesus was brought into harmony with Mohammed's general scheme of history as already exemplified in the account of the earlier prophets.

Our study of this evening has shown us the method and the aim of one religious leader. It shows him willing to take historical material wherever he could find it, to serve the great end he had at heart. It shows him moulding the material according to his own experiences, and making it serve the edification of his own followers. In all this I conceive that we are discovering something like a law of spiritual progress.

In the next lecture we shall approach the more distinctly theological part of our subject, in looking at Mohammed's doctrine of God.

and lawyers in Jerusalem, crucified a man in Jerusalem ; and they smote and mocked and killed him because they saw and were convinced that he was not God. Why will you cherish your delusion concerning this man ? ” The siege of Nagran was in the century before Mohammed's call, and while the (Ethiopic) account from which this language is quoted is comparatively late, we have no reason to suspect Moslem influence. Cf. Fell, *Die Christenverfolgungen in Südarabien*, Z.D.M.G., XXXV., p. 56.

LECTURE IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

MOHAMMED, like other reformers, raised his voice in conscious opposition to the existing system. In one of his first revelations he is bidden to say : "O, you that disbelieve ; I will not serve what you serve, nor do you serve what I serve. . . . You have your religion and I have mine."* The point at which he was consciously and most distinctly in opposition to his contemporaries was the unity of God. *There is no God but Allah*, was, and continues to be, the watchword of Islam. The infidels are most often described as those who associate other beings with Allah as objects of worship. In the sura just quoted Mohammed seems, indeed, to say that the Meccans did not worship the same God which he worshipped. But it is plain from other passages that he did not deny that Allah was *one* of the deities in their pantheon. He meant that their worship was so vitiated by its polytheistic character that it was no true worship. Allah, like Yahweh, tolerates no partners. "Thou shalt have no other gods in My presence" was with him, as with the Hebrews, the first commandment, and he appreciated it to the full. The declaration of God's unity : "God is One ; the Self-

* Sura 109.

existent God ; He begets not and is not begotten ; and there is none like to Him," may be put beside the declaration of Moses : "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh our God, Yahweh is One ; and thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with *all* thy mind and with *all* thy soul and with *all* thy strength." The oneness of God is a reason for the exclusive nature of the worship paid to Him. The Biblical statement that Yahweh is a jealous God is simply the affirmation of the truth known to Mohammed, that Allah admits no partners. With him, as with the Hebrew law-giver, there was a conviction of the infinite worthiness of the one God, a worthiness which admits none to comparison with Him.

Mohammed was not the first of the Arabs to recognize this truth. There is a very strong current of tradition to the effect that in this case also there were Reformers before the Reformation. Reflecting men had become dissatisfied with the popular religion. Some of them had sought refuge in Judaism or Christianity. Others were not drawn to these religions, but adopted monotheism and abandoned the worship of idols. An example is Zaid Ibn Amr, of whom Mohammed's earliest biographer says : "He adopted neither Christianity nor Judaism, but he gave up the religion of his people ; he abandoned the idols, kept himself from what was strangled, from blood, from what was offered to idols and from infanticide. He professed to worship the Lord of Abraham."* This Zaid was known to Mohammed, who, on hearing

* Weil, *Das Leben Mohammed's nach Mohammed Ibn Ishak bearbeitet von Ibn Hisham* (1864), I, p. 108.

of his death, said : In the Resurrection he will form a communion by himself.* Several such *hanifs* as they are called—the same word is applied to Abraham as we saw—are mentioned in the time of Mohammed. Some of them joined him, some rejected him. They are an indication that the more earnest spirits were already breaking away from heathenism.

The difference between them and Mohammed is that they were content to work out their own salvation and let other people alone—to go to heaven their way, and let the others go to the other place their way, as a modern writer describes toleration—whereas Mohammed felt the impulse to preach against idolatry. This it was which roused the Meccans. Their religion was a part of the standing order, and to change it meant revolution. Mecca owed its importance and its wealth to the fact that it was an emporium. Its trade was secured by its being an asylum in which tribes otherwise hostile could meet in safety. The visible pledge of asylum was the presence of the gods of all the tribes at the Meccan sanctuary. To demand that these gods should be destroyed and Allah alone worshipped, was to demand the overthrow of their social and political institutions, and, as they regarded it, such a movement would be followed by financial ruin. Their first theory was that the demand could come only from a man possessed by a devil. But as Mohammed showed much method in his madness, they took active measures against him, so that at last he found safety only in flight.

Mere negations, however, do not triumph. The

* Sprenger, *Leben Muhammed's*, I, p. 83.

creed of Islam is indeed there is no God but Allah. But behind this creed, which is negative in form, there lies a positive conception of the character of Allah—a conception which was clearly set forth by Mohammed, which attracted his followers, and which is still the real belief of all reflecting Moslems. Even in the earliest suras, Allah is a definite and active personality. Mohammed would heartily have accepted the statement of the Westminster Shorter Catechism: "There is but one only, the *living and true God*." Note the following Koran passages:

"He is God, besides whom there is no God. He is the Knower of the secret and of the manifest. He is the Merciful, the Compassionate. He is the King, the All-Holy, the Complete, the Protector, the Guardian, the Almighty, the Ruler, the Glorious. Far from Him be that which they associate with Him. He is God, the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner—all excellent names are His. Whatever is in heaven and on earth praises Him. He is the Almighty, the All-wise." *

"Say to them: To whom belongs the earth and all that is in it—do you know? They will say: It belongs to Allah. Answer them: Will you not then praise Him? Who is the Lord of the seven heavens, and the spacious canopy? They will say: Allah. Answer them: Will you not then fear Him? In whose hand is the rule of the universe, who protects, but against whom no one protects—do you know? They will say: It is Allah. Answer them: Then why will you be bewitched [by idolatry]? Verily, we have sent them the truth, but they are liars." †

Biblical parallels to several of these predicates readily suggest themselves. But in order to get a

* 59²²⁻²⁴.

† 23⁸⁶⁻⁹².

clearer view of the doctrine of the Koran, we shall be obliged to adopt some sort of arrangement under which we can group together the great variety of *dicta probantia*. Let us note, then :

1. The God of Mohammed is *Allah*, the God already known by name to the Arabs. In the passage just quoted, Mohammed conducts a dialogue with his adversaries in which they show themselves no strangers to Allah. It would be precarious to build on such a passage a theory that Allah was already recognized as the supreme God of the pantheon. But it at least shows that the heathen knew Him by name, and that they could not seriously object to the doctrine of the Prophet as new and unheard of. Probably they had never reflected on the subjects on which he questioned them. In early religions the question of creation, for example, is not raised ; the world is taken as it is, and no theory of its origin is formulated. When the question is raised, the Meccans are more likely to answer Allah than anything else, because Allah is the most general name for God. The word means simply *the divinity*, and could be applied to any God. Hobal was Allah at Mecca, and another God was Allah at Taif. Two Arabs might swear by Allah, and each have his own divinity in mind, just as Abraham and Abimelech might both swear by Elohim, though the Elohim of Abraham was Yahweh and the Elohim of Abimelech was another.

It is not necessary to assume, therefore, as some have done, that there was already a fully developed doctrine of *Allah Taala*—God Most High—among

the Arabs before Mohammed.* The case was not different from that of the Hebrews. When Yahweh announced His proper name, he was careful to identify Himself with the Elohim already known to the people and to their fathers. The only difference is that Mohammed contented himself (at least finally) with the general name, while the Hebrew kept both names, though insisting that Yahweh is the only Elohim.

As a visible and substantial evidence that Allah was not an unknown God, Mohammed retained the ancient sanctuary of the Kaaba. So long as he was at Mecca he seems to have had no hesitation in this. When he went to Medina he tried to make a change. But he was obliged to return, after no long time, to his original position. As evidence that it was his original position, we have Sura 106, apparently an early one, in which he exhorts the Koreish to invoke *the Lord of this house*. In other religions we see the tendency to identify the newly revealed God with one already known. Even the Apostle Paul intimates that the God whom he preaches at Athens is one already worshipped there.

The proposition that Allah is the only God does not necessarily mean that the other so-called gods have absolutely no existence. This was too radical a step to take all at once. Mohammed conceded the existence of spirits or demons who had seduced men to their worship. The Arabic word for these beings is *Jinn* (collective), and as we have no exact equivalent it is better to retain this word in translation: "But

* Dozy, *Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Islamisme* (1879), p. 5.

they give associates to God, the Jinn, whom He created; and out of ignorance they falsely attribute to Him sons and daughters. Far be this from Him! He is exalted above what they ascribe to Him." * In another passage, the false gods are questioned by Allah at the Judgment, and avow that they have misled their worshippers; and again we are told that the idolaters worship only Satan the rebellious.† It is not mere dramatic imagery intended to emphasize the evil of polytheism that is presented in these passages. Mohammed admitted that the false gods have a real existence. What he denied was not their reality but their divinity—their power to help or harm.

We find in this a distinct parallel to both Old Testament and New. It will suffice to quote Leviticus 17: "They shall no longer sacrifice their sacrifices to the satyrs (*se'irim*, the desert demons) after which they have [heretofore] gone astray." In Deuteronomy also we read that they sacrificed to demons (*shedim*) instead of God.‡ For the New Testament, we have Paul's assertions that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God."§ The belief in spirits which infest the desert is very old among the Semites—indeed beliefs of this kind are found among all nations. It was therefore natural that Mohammed should identify these beings

* G¹⁰⁰.

† 28^{62f} and 4¹¹⁷.

‡ With Lev. 17⁷ cf. 2 Chron. 11¹⁵. With Deut. 32¹⁷ cf. Ps. 106³⁷. Gunkel combines with these Ps. 40³ where the idols are called *rehabim*: "evil beings, enemies to man."

§ I. Cor. 10²⁰.

with the divinities worshipped by the heathen Arabs. It is not unlikely, however, that he was also influenced remotely by the Biblical statements just quoted.

2. The God of Mohammed is also the God of Jews and Christians. This also is indicated by the name (Allah, Al-ilah), which is found in Hebrew (Eloah, Elohim) and in the Christian Syriac. The identity is not only clear from the name itself, but from direct assertions of the Koran: "Debate with those who have the Scriptures only in the most honorable manner . . . and say: We believe in what is revealed to us and in what is revealed to you; your God and our God are one God, and we are resigned to Him." * The doctrine of Mohammed is like the doctrine of Christianity in its universalism. Allah is not the God of a particular race only; He is God of the whole earth. This was also the doctrine of the Old Testament in its latest stages. The religious impulse seems to find in the oneness of God the unifying principle of human history. Hence comes the necessity of finding our God in the God of the fathers. The parallel between Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, which Mohammed extended to himself was another expression of the continuity of the one God—a God who has never left Himself without witness. By some one of His prophets He has repeatedly called men to repentance and obedience. That in this respect Mohammed occupies ground which is more distinctly Christian than Jewish, needs no demonstration.

3. This God enters into personal relation with

* 29¹⁵.

those who believe on Him. He Himself is a person—there is no pantheism in the Koran. The Gnostic sects which swarmed in the farther East had not penetrated Arabia with their emanistic speculations. At least we find no trace of their influence in the theology of Mohammed. God and the universe appear to him as sharply distinguished as man and the world. Not even in polemic does he betray any suspicion of pantheism. The whole impression made by what he says, and by what he does not say, is to the effect that he could not even conceive of a God without personality.

To a certain extent, his view was anthropomorphic. If we mean by anthropomorphism every ascription of thought or feeling to God, then all religions except Buddhism are infected with anthropomorphism. Islam, or at least the Koran, is not extreme in attributing a human form to God. To speak of His hands (as is done a few times) is almost unavoidable in describing His activity. Beyond this He does not receive bodily members. That the traditions are more pronounced than the Koran, is only what we should expect, but how far we can rely upon these is difficult to decide. We shall have no hesitancy in accepting tradition where it makes Mohammed say that in Paradise the believer shall see God, for this is a hope common to other believers. On the whole the anthropomorphism of the Koran is not more pronounced than that of the Bible.

Now, as to the communion which exists between God and his worshippers—we must recognize this also as a principle of all religion. Even in heathen-

ism the gods enter into personal relations with their worshippers: "They take the Satans *as their protectors* besides Allah, yet think they are guided aright;" "Allah is the protector of those who believe; He brings them from darkness into light. But as for those who disbelieve, their protectors are the devils; they bring them from light to darkness."* The word translated protector (*wali*) means the next of kin, who has the right and the obligation of blood revenge—the *go'el* of the Old Testament. Mohammed's conception is precisely that of Job, who regards God as his "Redeemer" in exactly the sense in which this passage speaks of protectors. Mohammed allows that the idolaters have entered into the relation of clientage (if I may so say) to their gods. The protection promised is of no avail, not because the relation does not exist, but because the protectors have no power to carry out what they have promised. In the next world the worshipped and the worshippers shall alike be brought to confusion. On the other hand the God and Protector of Mohammed is all powerful, and therefore, able to carry out His promise.

The sense of loyalty to God is expressed in the frequent use of the term *my Lord*, in which the speaker embodies his claim on God, and God's claim on him. In the earliest group of suras this term is used about three times as often as the name Allah, and thus shows the vivid sense of God's presence with which the Prophet entered on his mission. In

* 7²⁸ and 2²⁵³ f. The word *Taghut* used for the false gods is obscure; but there can be no doubt of its meaning in this context.

the choice of the term he was doubtless under Scriptural influence, for God is *Lord of all* both in the Old Testament and in the New.* The vividness of Mohammed's faith, which impels him to say *my Lord* does not cause him to forget the claims of others. God is the Lord of Abraham, of Moses, even of the unbelievers.† In the prayer which in Islam takes the place of the Lord's Prayer—the *Fatiha*—He is the *Lord of the worlds*.‡ But He is also the one to whom the believer cries for help.

4. Allah is the Creator. This is a conception which can be adequately held only in a monotheistic religion. Polytheism, so far as it has a doctrine of creation, thinks of the universe as modified by the strife of many gods. But where God is one, creation and lordship go together. Mohammed followed Biblical precedent in emphasizing their union. One of his most frequent arguments is that Allah is Creator and therefore Lord, or even that He is Creator and therefore the only true God. There is no suspicion of the eternity of matter in the Koran. In a tradition we find this question put to Mohammed: "O, Apostle of Allah, where was our Cherisher before creating His creation?" He replied: "God was, and nothing was with Him, and God created

* The word *Rabb*, Mohammed's word for *Lord*, is not used of God in Hebrew. In Aramaic it is said to be so used by the Mandæans (Michaelis, *Lexicon Syr.* sub voce). This is another indication that Mohammed's ideas were derived from some "heretical" source.

† 51³⁰, 79¹⁶, 51⁴⁴, cf. 69¹⁰.

‡ 1¹, cf. 69¹³. The word for *worlds* (or *ages* it may be) is borrowed from the Aramaic, whether Christian or Jewish is impossible to tell. Cf. I. Tim. 1⁷.

His imperial throne upon water." * The reference of the last clause is so obviously to the account in Genesis, where the Spirit of God brooded on the face of the waters, that we may assume Biblical influence on the tradition. Probably the influence extended to Mohammed himself, for his account of the creation is largely borrowed from the Bible. For example, we are told that: "God creates what He will; when He decides upon a thing He says: Be! and it is." † The Biblical parallel is familiar. Another feature of the Biblical account found in the Koran, is the accomplishment of the work in six days: "And it is He who created the heavens and the earth in the space of six days, while His throne was on the waters." ‡ An evidence of Mohammed's freedom in treating Biblical materials is found, however, in his assertion that God was not affected by fatigue §—an evident rejection of the Old Testament word that God *rested* the seventh day. Moreover he does not seem to be clear as to the order of the six days' work: He says in one passage: "Will you disbelieve in God who made the earth in two days . . . and made the mountains which tower above it, and Who arranged provision upon it in four days, sufficient for those who ask. Then He ascended to the heavens when they were yet smoke, and said to them and to the earth: Come, willingly or unwillingly! They replied: We come willingly. And He divided them into seven heavens in two days, and communicated to each heaven its order, and We decked the lower

* *Mishcat*, II., 650.

† 11⁹, cf. 50³⁷, 57⁴.

‡ 3⁴², 16⁴².

§ 50³⁷.

heaven with lamps and guardians—this was the decree of the Almighty, the Wise." * By counting the two days first mentioned as part of the four, we can make out the requisite total of six. But even then it is impossible to find traces of the Biblical arrangement, in which the creation of the heavenly bodies takes place on the fourth day. But from the religious point of view Mohammed had thoroughly adopted the doctrine of the Bible, as the following somewhat extended quotation will make plain :

"It is God who raised the heavens without visible pillars ; then He ascended to the throne, and made the sun and moon obedient [to His will], so that each runs to its appointed goal. He regulates affairs and makes plain His signs, that you may be sure of the meeting with your Lord. And it is He who spread out the earth and made in it mountains and rivers ; and of every fruit He made two kinds. He makes the night succeed the day—in this are signs for people who reflect. And in the earth are tracts [different though] bordering on each other : vineyards and fields and palms, in groups or isolated. They are supplied with the same water, yet We make the quality of one better than that of another—verily in this are signs for people who understand. . . . It is He who shows you the lightning, an object of terror and of desire, and who brings up the clouds heavy with rain. The thunder celebrates His praise, the angels also, moved by fear of Him. He sends the thunderbolts and smites whom He will. Yet all the while men are disputing concerning God, though He is the mighty in power. To Him sincere prayer should be made, and those whom men invoke besides Him shall not answer them in any respect, any more than one stretching out his hands to the water which he cannot reach to bring it to his mouth. The prayer of the unbelievers is only loss.

* 41 8 ID.

All that are in heaven and on earth live by God, willingly or unwillingly, even the evil angels and men and women. What is God of heaven and earth? He is God. And will you call a greater God a God, created, made of human hands? And the dead and the unborn called to the witness the same as the living? Will they give God evidence who speak in the witness, so that the witness is confirmed between them? [They.] And a God, because, He is the God, the Christian.¹²

The passage above has neither end nor beginning, as we have seen. Although not parallel to any single Biblical text, it is full of Biblical allusions. God is in both Old Testament and New, the Creator of heaven and earth; He makes the sun and the appointed waters; He spreads out the earth and what grows upon it; and He also makes that the woman. Further: it is He who created the first man, as well as both for the service of man, bringing forth seed out of the earth. He brings up the Canaanites also, and makes the Egyptians with him as one of His creations; and He is of course the giver of rain. The figure of the thunder is the voice of God which we find in the Old Testament is not repeated by Mohammed, but in every other respect his conception of Allah as the master of the storm is parallel to that of the Bible. And as we say of the conception that the creation is for the benefit of man, whose gratitude should lead him to worship his Creator. All created things adore Him. For

¹² pp. 120.

¹³ For the Biblical passages consult Gen. 1st, Ps. 104, Job. 38, Ps. 105, 106, 107. Other passages will suggest themselves to the reader.

only does the thunder chant His praise, and the angels bow before Him, all things on earth join with them: "All that are in heaven and on earth praise God, His is the kingdom and He is the Ruler over all." *

It is also in accord with Biblical ideas that the creation should be used as evidence of the character of God. It is, first of all, an evidence of His power. When men scoffed at the idea of a resurrection as being a thing impossible, Mohammed pointed out that to bring men from dust the second time would not be difficult for Him who created them out of clay at the first. The creation is an evidence that God can do (and therefore will do) what He promises or threatens. The argument is the same used by Deutero-Isaiah. When the people are faint-hearted concerning the promises of God, this prophet reminds them that the promises come from the One "who made all things, who stretched out the heavens alone, and spread abroad the earth by Himself." Mohammed was more concerned with the doubts of unbelievers than with the discouragements of believers, but in bringing his message to his people, he reminds them that the power shown in creation may be turned upon them in chastisement.

The creation is, further, an evidence of God's knowledge. He that made all things must certainly know all things. There is perhaps no attribute which is more frequently mentioned than this. *He is the Knowing, the Wise*, or, *God is a discerner of what they do*, have become to Mohammed stereotype phrases

with which he rounds off his periods. That he was not unmindful of their significance is seen from the more extended propositions such as the following: "Do they not know that God knows what they conceal and what they discourse about in private, and that God is the knower of secrets." * Again: "Three do not sit in secret converse except that He makes the fourth, or five without His being the sixth; and whether there be few or more, He is with them wherever they are. In the day of resurrection He will tell them what they have done—verily God is omniscient." † The Biblical parallels are too numerous to quote. The particular kind of knowledge which the Psalmist finds wonderful when he says: "Thine eyes saw my formless substance and in Thy book all was written in the days when it was taking shape" ‡ is also emphasized by Mohammed. And where the New Testament gives the fall of a sparrow as within the omniscient eye, Mohammed adduces the fall of a leaf. §

5. God not only creates, He also governs. The kingdom of heaven and earth is His: "Verily your Lord is the God who created the heavens and the earth in six days; then He took His seat upon the throne, making the night darken the day, which [in its turn] follows swiftly; and the sun and moon and the constellations are obedient to His command. Do not creation and rule belong to Him? Blessed be God, Lord of the worlds." || The mind of the speaker sees in God the great efficient cause of all. He is

* 9¹⁹, cf. 21¹¹⁰.

† 58⁸, cf. 3²⁷.

‡ Ps. 139¹⁶, cf. Koran 13⁹.

§ 6⁵⁰, cf. Matt. 10²⁹. || 7⁵².

the active mover of the constellations and the seasons. In another passage He is said to sit upon the throne *conducting the affairs* of the universe. He not only gives rain, driving the clouds as He will; He rules in the affairs of men: "O God, Ruler of the Kingdom, Thou givest the kingdom to whom Thou wilt, and Thou takest away the kingdom from whom Thou wilt. Thou strengthenest whom Thou wilt, and Thou humblest whom Thou wilt, and in Thy hand is good; Thou art omnipotent."* We are reminded of the Song of Hannah; "Yahweh makes poor and makes rich: He makes low and also raises on high." How far God employs second causes we need not now stop to inquire.

6. As the ruler of the universe, God is also the God of history. The principle of His government is very simple: He rewards those who obey and He punishes the disobedient. This implies some revelation of His will. As we saw in Mohammed's treatment of his narrative material, all history falls into epochs, each of which rounds out the same cycle. God first makes His will known by a prophet. Men either receive the message and obey, or they reject it and are destroyed. It may not always be necessary that a prophet interpret the will of God. Creation is itself a revelation: "In the heavens and the earth are signs for those who believe; in your creation also and in the animals which are dispersed [over the earth] are signs for those who are firm in their faith, and in the succession of night and day, and in the portion which God sends down from the heavens,

* 3²⁵, cf. I. Sam. 2⁷.

with which He revives the earth after its death, and in the direction of the winds—in these are signs for people of intelligence.” * There is in nature therefore a revelation of God. Whether this alone is a sufficient guide does not appear. The Prophet seems not to have raised this question. In history, as he saw it, God was accustomed to send additional revelations by the hand of His messengers. From this point of view His justice becomes manifest—He gives men the alternative of obedience or disobedience. He can rightly punish those who disobey and He can rightly reward those who obey.

It follows therefore that Allah is a God of justice. Here again, Mohammed had a practical rather than a speculative interest. It had never occurred to him (apparently) to inquire whether right or wrong are dependent on the will of God. If the question had been put to him he would very likely have answered in the affirmative. God is an absolute monarch ; He does what He pleases. So far Mohammed would have said that the will of God is the ground of right and wrong. But it is nevertheless the constant assumption of the Koran that God is a morally perfect character. His action is such that it meets our idea of right.† Though none can restrain or call Him to account, yet He does not punish without cause. If we fail to find perfect justice in His dealings with men in this present life, we must turn to the future when all

* 45²⁻⁵.

† “ The Apostle of God said : When God created the creation He wrote a book which is near Him upon the imperial throne, and what is written in it is this : Verily My compassion overcomes My anger.”—*Mishcat*, I., p. 563.

will be made plain. The thought of the Day of Judgment is therefore indispensable to our idea of God's justice. That day completes the purpose of creation. "Did you reckon that We created you in sport, and that you would not appear before Us?" * This is one of God's questions at the Judgment. It implies that the purpose of creation is attained only in the final apportionment of reward and punishment. Without this, the creation of man would have been a vain act.

God does not always act according to our desires or hopes. This is a matter of universal experience. The explanation of it in the Koran, as in the Bible, is that God proves men: "Verily, We proved them as we proved the owners of the garden, who swore that they would gather its fruits the next morning. They swore without reservation, but while they slept there came a visitation from the Lord, and in the morning it [the garden] was like a field of stubble." † Such an experience is sent to try the state of man's heart; he must learn from it that he is not independent of God. The conclusion is plain, and is expressed in language which agrees almost verbally with an exhortation of the New Testament: "Do not say concerning anything: I will do it to-morrow, without adding *if God will*, and remember thy Lord when thou hast forgotten Him, and say: Perhaps my Lord will guide me to the accomplishment of this affair." ‡ The alternations of fortune in the experience of the Moslem community are explained as a part of their probation: "We make the days [of good and evil

* 23¹¹⁷.† 68¹⁷ ff.‡ 18²³, cf. James 4¹⁵.

fortune] to alternate among men, that God may know those who believe, and may take from you martyrs for Himself." * Were constant good the lot of man he would become insupportable : " If God gave provision in abundance to His servants they would act insolently in the earth. He therefore apportions according to His will—He knows and sees His servants." † God's purpose is plain : " We will prove you by ill fortune and by good, as a test, and unto Us shall you be brought." ‡ The thought is distinctly Biblical. Abraham is tested by the command to offer his son. So the Koran says in giving an account of the same incident.§ That Mohammed so understood the experience of Job, to which he also alludes, is made probable by the concluding sentence of that passage : " We found him possessed of patience." || How thoroughly Mohammed adopted the doctrine is seen in his statement that even the game which came in sight of the pilgrims to Mecca was sent to prove them, to discover whether they would obey the law : " That God may know him who fears Him in his heart." ¶ Apparent cases in which God's actions cannot be explained on our ideas of justice are therefore only apparent. He acts in a mysterious way sometimes, but in the end all will be plain, and we shall see the wicked punished and the good rewarded.

The reward of those who do well is affirmed on almost every page of the Koran. The great burden of Mohammed's preaching is the Day of Judgment. This day will result in endless pleasure for the good,

* 3¹³⁴.§ 37¹⁰⁶, cf. 2¹¹⁸.† 42⁹⁶.|| 38⁴³.‡ 21³⁶.¶ 5⁹⁵.

as it will bring endless pain to the evil: "Shall I tell you what is better [than the pleasures of this world]? Those who fear God shall possess in the presence of their Lord Gardens in which are perennial streams, and pure wives, and the good favor of God; God has regard to His servants." "Those who fear God shall dwell in the midst of gardens and fountains, partaking of what their Lord gives them; they are the ones who did well in their earlier [that is, their earthly] life." * God, therefore, does not desire to bring men into evil. After speaking of the future life, the speaker adds: "These are the wonders of God which we recite to thee; God does not desire injustice to the universe." † The passage reminds us of Ezekiel's declaration, that God does not desire the death of the wicked, and the resemblance is the more marked in that both cases imply that the prophet is sent *because* God does not desire to do injustice. His desire is rather that man may have opportunity to repent. Nevertheless, He must take cognizance of men's actions. This is one evidence of His superiority over the idols: "He who is mindful of every soul with regard to what it has earned—will they take others besides such a God?" ‡ Here is where His omniscience most nearly concerns us. Because He is all-seeing, He can vindicate justice: "How will it be when We assemble you to a Day concerning which there is no doubt, and every soul shall be paid what it has earned, and none shall be treated unjustly?" §

As for God's justice in punishing, we may find it

* 3¹³ and 51¹⁵ f.

† 3¹⁰⁴.

‡ 13³³.

§ 3²⁴.

even in the present world. Historically it appears in the destruction of Pharaoh and other wrong-doers in the past: "God seized them for their sins, and God is strict in taking account." * Elsewhere God is described as quick in reckoning, so that He does not fail in determining the just dues of each one: "We will establish the scales of equity in the Day of Resurrection, and no soul shall be wronged in any matter; were it the weight of a grain of mustard seed, We will pay it, and We are sufficient as accountants." † The phrase *grain of mustard seed* makes us suspect New Testament influence, but it may be only a proverbial phrase, of whose New Testament origin Mohammed had no knowledge. The conception of the scales of justice is found in the Bible, though also found in extra-Biblical sources. In the Bible it is generally the *men* who are weighed instead of their actions. The figure is natural and appropriate in either form. The specific statement that God calls men to account is also Biblical.‡

Because of His justice God hates the evil: "Those who disbelieve will be summoned [and told]: The hatred of God is greater than your hatred of each other [was] when you were invited to the faith and disbelieved." § The path in which the believer desires to be led is the path of those with whom God is *not angry*. The Israelites who murmured at the manna, returned with the anger of God upon them. When a believer kills another believer, his portion

* 3°.

† 21⁴⁸.‡ Compare Rom. 14¹², I. Sam. 2³, Ps. 62¹⁰, Dan. 5²⁷.§ 40¹⁰.

will be hell fire : “ God is angry with him and curses him and prepares for him a grievous punishment.” * Similar language is used of the Israelites who were changed into apes and swine, and also of the hypocrites at Medina.† How closely it follows Biblical precedent, I need scarcely say. In the Old Testament, God is a just judge, and as such is angry every day. When the people worship the golden calf His anger burns against them.‡ In the New Testament also, the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.

7. Strict justice would result in the extermination of the race : “ If God should take men in their sin, He would not leave upon the earth a living creature. But He grants them delay till a fixed term. When their term shall come it will not be delayed or advanced an hour.” § God is therefore *long-suffering* ; He does not hasten His punishment. This is the explanation of a fact which probably perplexed Mohammed as it had perplexed the Biblical writers. We see that in this world wicked men often enjoy good fortune for a long time. The perplexity does not arise merely from the inequality in the lot of the good and the bad. The prolongation of the life of a wicked man gives him a prolonged opportunity to do the evil things that God hates. Why does not God speedily cut such men off? Two answers are possible. God may be giving them the opportunity to repent ; or, on the other hand, He may be allowing them to fill up the measure of their iniquity, so as to

* 4⁹⁵, cf. 2⁵⁸.

† 5⁶⁵ and 48⁶.

‡ Ex. 32¹⁰, Ps. 7¹², and Rom. 1¹⁸.

§ 16⁶³.

earn the more complete and exemplary punishment. Both these solutions of the problem are presented in the Bible, and Mohammed also seems to have entertained both, though he does not sharply distinguish between them. The passage quoted above seems to say only that a strict administration of justice cannot be carried out, because no one could stand before it. It agrees with the Psalmist who says: "If Yahweh should closely watch iniquities, O Lord, who could stand?" * On this side, God's mercy is simply a concession to human weakness. But that He also spares men in order that they may repent, while not directly stated, is implied in many passages which speak of Him as merciful and gracious, as inviting men to repentance and Himself loving to turn to those who turn to Him. But we find also the theory that the wicked are spared in order that they may (like the Amorites) fill up the measure of their iniquity: "Let not those who disbelieve reckon that the long life which We grant them is a good to them. We grant it only that they may increase their guilt, and they shall receive a shameful punishment." †

Although this threat is uttered against those who persist in their iniquity, there is a distinct doctrine of forgiveness taught in the Koran. Sins committed before the coming of the revelation are passed over with indulgence, because allowance is made for the state of ignorance. There is here a very close parallel to Paul's declaration that God overlooked the times of ignorance, but *now* calls on all men everywhere to repent.‡ A striking parallel with a Biblical passage

* Ps. 130³.† 3¹⁷², cf. Gen. 15¹⁶.‡ Acts 17³⁰, cf. Kor. 5⁹⁶.

is found again where the justice and the mercy of God are placed side by side: "The revelation of the Book from God, the Mighty, the Wise; the one who forgives sin, accepting repentance, strict in His punishments, the Bountiful, besides whom there is no God." * The Biblical parallel which I have in mind is of course the Name proclaimed before Moses in Horeb: "Yahweh, a merciful and gracious God, slow to anger and plenteous in kindness and truth, keeping kindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin; but who will not pronounce innocent—visiting the iniquities of fathers upon children and grandchildren, upon the third generation and upon the fourth." † In the case of Mohammed, at any rate, there seems to be no consciousness that justice could conflict with mercy. In other words, there is no theory of an atonement. The words expiation and redemption may be said to exist in Arabic but they have sunk to almost trivial importance. In certain cases of transgression, a sort of equivalent must be paid. If a man breaks his oath, he must, as an *expiation*, ‡ feed or clothe ten poor men, or free a slave. If either of these be beyond his power he must fast a certain number of days. *Redemption* is used of a similar fine or satisfaction. In no case is there an intimation that this is more than a punishment inflicted for the sin. It is nowhere brought into relation with the wrath of God. Atonement or propitia-

* 40¹⁻³.† Ex. 34^{6,7}.

‡ The word used is *Kaffara*, corresponding to the Hebrew Kaporeth. *Fidya*, redemption, is also from a root used in Hebrew. But Arabic usage seems independent of Old Testament influence in this case.

tion in the sense in which they are understood in Christian theology do not appear in the Koran.

That goodness is one of the attributes of God must be evident from what has already been said. This goodness extends to all His creatures: "There is not a living thing in the earth whose nourishment is not dependent upon God. He knows its abiding place and its resting."* Even the birds are sustained in their flight by Him.† He adapts His burdens to those who carry them: "We do not lay upon any soul more than it can bear."‡ The consequence is given in the words: "If you remember the favors of God, you will not be able to count them."§ In a number of passages the Koran rises to the affirmation of the love of God. But the objects of His love are those who do well. The sublime declaration of the New Testament: "God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," seems to be without parallel in the sacred book of Islam.

Here is where Mohammed and Christianity (at least in the orthodox form) part company. Up to this point, his idea is essentially the theism of the Bible. He may be said (as he has been said) to maintain the separation of God from the world with more precision and rigor than does Judaism even.¶ But in substance he holds the Biblical idea of God, and he would not have objected to the definition current among us—that God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness,

* 11⁸.

§ 16¹⁸, cf. Ps. 40⁶.

† 67¹⁹.

‡ 67¹⁵³.

¶ Dozy, *L'Islamisme*, p. 315.

justice, goodness, and truth. Moreover he holds to God as a present personality, "nearer to man than the vein of his neck." * But he was not led to the thought that God could or would come to man by an incarnation. As we saw in the last lecture, this doctrine was probably not fairly presented to him. He learned of it as the deification of a man, rather than as the incarnation of God. In this form he could not help rejecting the doctrine. Nor on the side of the mediatorial work of Christ did he have any leaning toward the Christian view. The necessity of bridging over the chasm between God and the world—a necessity that appeals very strongly to some minds—seems not to have existed for him. We should remember that the doctrine of mediation was associated with what he must class as idolatry. In the Eastern Church, the mediation of saints and angels is held very strongly even to the present day, and leads to the excessive devotion paid to them and to their pictures.† In heathenism the subordinate divinities are intercessors with the higher gods. The whole idea of mediation therefore presented itself to Mohammed under an unfavorable aspect. This was especially true after he had made his experiment at compromise with the Meccans. There was a time when he tried to make use of this doctrine of mediation, to produce something on which he and his countrymen could unite. His plan was to recognize the three Goddesses, upon whose worship the Meccans laid the most stress, as daughters of Allah and mediators with Him. Every worldly motive urged him to such a compromise, and

* 50¹⁵.† Cf. Kattenbusch, *Confessionskunde*, I., p. 461.

he probably flattered himself that he would thereby secure the essentials of his system. The Arabs have been willing to forget what actually took place. It seems probable that a formal agreement was made, by which the Meccans recognized the supremacy of Allah, while Mohammed and his followers were to allow the worship of the three Goddesses as intercessors with Allah. All that has come down to us, is a tradition to the effect that Mohammed, in reciting the fifty-third sura of the Koran, included in it these words: "Do you not see Lat and Uzza and Manat, the third besides? These are the exalted maidens* and their intercession is to be hoped for." The Meccans who were present were surprised and delighted at the mention of their divinities and at the close of the recitation all prostrated themselves, following the example of the Prophet. The tradition goes on to say, that in the evening he was visited by Gabriel who heard him repeat the sura and disavowed the compromising words. Mohammed was convinced that he had been misled by Satan and he at once adopted the true reading and published it the next day in the words: "Do you not see Lat and Uzza and Manat the third besides? Shall you have sons and He have daughters?† That were, indeed, a wrong division. These are but names which you and your fathers have named; God has not delegated

* The word is obscure and the Arabs themselves are divided as to its meaning. I choose among the meanings (or conjectures) the word most appropriate to the context. The authorities are given by Sprenger, *Leben Muhammed's*, II., p. 45 ff.; Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, II., p. 150 ff.

† Daughters are inferior to sons in the view of the Arabs, cf. 43¹⁶.

to them any power. [The unbelievers] follow only conjecture and what their souls desire, though there has come to them guidance from their Lord." * So far tradition ; whatever the actual course of events, it seems probable that Mohammed made a serious attempt to introduce authorized mediators of a divine character into his religion. But the scheme would not work. His idea of the unity of God was too absolute to admit even subordinate divinities. After this experience, he was careful to defend the strict oneness and transcendentality of God.

The incarnation and the mediatorial work of Christ, therefore, fall (for him) under the same condemnation with the heathen ideas which he rejected: "Men serve, besides God, that which cannot harm nor profit them, and they say: These are our intercessors with God. Say to them: Will you inform God concerning what He does not know either in the heavens or in the earth? Praise be to Him; He is exalted above what they associate with Him." "Men say: The Compassionate has taken a son. Far be it from Him! Rather, these are honored servants; they do not speak to Him before He speaks to them, and they do according to His commands. He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and none intercede except for the one for whom permission is given, and they constantly tremble in fear of Him." † Intercession is here denied on two grounds: the intercessors cannot tell God anything He does not already know; and no created being dares to speak to Him without His permission, which permission will

* 53¹⁹⁻²³.

† 10¹⁹, 21²⁶⁻²⁹.

not be given in case the intercession concerns a man with whom He is already displeased. It is in accord with this that we read: "And warn those who fear God that they shall be gathered to their Lord; besides Him they have neither protector nor intercessor." *

But, like the most of us, Mohammed was not always entirely consistent. On this point he was led to modify his position. Probably his own experience furnishes the explanation. He was himself often asked by his followers to pray for them. He found satisfaction also in praying for those he loved. His experience of the value of intercession in this world led him to believe that in the other world he would be allowed thus to help his followers. The traditions report him as saying that in the Day of Judgment he will intercede even when the other prophets declare their inability. It is possible that these traditions † are colored by the views of later times. But we are tempted to allow them some weight, because some Koran passages seem to allow the intercession of those to whom God gives permission, by which he means the greater prophets—those who had founded religions. These would be allowed to intercede for their followers and to bring them into Paradise.

All this shows how far Mohammed was from entertaining the ideas of incarnation, atonement, or mediation, as these have been developed in Christian theology. It has been supposed by some that he made one attempt at postulating a difference of persons (to use the established theological term) in the Godhead.

* 6⁵¹ and cf. 2⁴⁵.

† Cf. *Mishcat*, II., p. 603 ff.

In one group of suras, he uses predominantly the name Rahman as a name of God. As the word occurs in Hebrew and Aramaic, it is probable that he borrowed it. It is a perfectly good Arabic form however, and occurs in inscriptions from southern Arabia which are apparently older than the time of Mohammed.* It means *the Compassionate* and is used as an exact equivalent for the name Allah. Thus: Rahman punishes the wicked; He sits on the throne; His signs [or revelations] are recited to men; to Him Satan is disobedient; and at the Last Day men shall be congregated to Him.† There is here no trace of a second person of the Godhead, a Divine Mediator, or an Emanation from the Supreme. All we can base on the phenomena, is the theory that Mohammed wished to introduce another name for God, perhaps because *Allah* was the name associated with the old heathenism. Possibly the mistake he made in the concession to the Meccans, caused in his mind a revolt even against their vocabulary. Rahmānān was the name of God the Father among the Christians of Southern Arabia. Its meaning was appropriate to his purpose. The choice was therefore a good one, and the motive of the choice was honorable. But the obstacles were too many. The small but earnest band of Moslems were already attached to the old name. They had taken up the cause of Allah and

* The adjective form *rahmani* occurs once in the Old Testament, Lam. 4¹⁰. For the Talmud cf. Levy, N. H. W. B. *sub voce*, and Geiger in Z. D. M. G., XXI., p. 488 ff. The latter also discusses the Syriac use. For the inscriptions, Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte Arabiens* (1889), pp. 4, 13.

† 19^{1b}, 20¹, 19³⁹, 45, 88.

His Apostle. Rahman they knew not. In their perplexity and in the renewed and bitter persecution which came upon them, Mohammed had enough to do to hold on to what he had already attained. The attempt to introduce the new name was therefore abandoned with the words: "Call upon Allah, or call upon Rahman; by whatever name you call upon Him [He hears]; all beautiful names are His."* In all this there was no inconsistency, and no near approach to Christian doctrine.

One thing more must be said. The name which our Lord adopted and by which He taught us to call upon God was *our Father*. Mohammed nowhere rose to this assurance of faith. God was his Lord, his Protector, his Cherisher, but so far as I can discover, he never calls Him Father. It is likely that, in this respect also, the Prophet was restrained by the heathen conceptions which expressed themselves in similar language. We have some evidence that the primitive religions of the Semites, like those of other races, looked upon the God of a particular tribe as the father of the tribe.† The physical and material sense in which this was understood, would prevent Mohammed's adoption of a similar conception. And it is doubtful whether the Christianity of his day was capable of giving him a clear presentation of the Biblical idea. To the early Church, God was the supreme Lord who, so far from condescending to man, must be invoked through the saints, the martyrs, and the angels. The confession of faith was "the recognition of God as the One, the Supramun-

* 17¹¹⁰.† W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 31 ff.

dane, the Spiritual, the Almighty. God is the Creator and Ruler of the world and therefore the Lord." * This was probably as much as Mohammed ever heard from Christian sources. To this height he rose; we can hardly blame him for not rising higher.

Reviewing what has been said in this lecture, we are entitled to say that Mohammed made a great advance over the doctrine of God (if we may call it so) held by his contemporaries. All the indications point to the low esteem in which the heathen Arabs hold their gods. "When the oracle at Tabāla forbade the poet Imraulcais to make war on the slayers of his father, he broke the lot and dashed the pieces in the face of the god, exclaiming, with a gross and insulting expletive: 'If it had been thy father that was killed, thou wouldst not have refused me vengeance.'" † The incident is characteristic of heathenism. The gods, being gods of particular tribes, are of limited power, and, consequently, limited reverence is paid them. They stand on much the same plane with their worshippers, whose kinsmen, fellows, allies, they are. Mohammed had the view of a God more exalted, more powerful, infinite in His perfections (or at least beyond any human standard), and, therefore, more worthy of reverence and adoration. When Mohammed first came to Medina, his new followers used to say in their prayers, "Peace be to Allah," using the salutation with which they were accustomed to greet their friends. Mohammed commanded: "Do not say: Peace to Allah! for Allah Himself is peace. Say,

* Harnack, *Grundriss d. Dogmengeschichte*², p. 35.

† W. R. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

rather : Eternal life belongs to Allah, and mercies and goodness." * The incident illustrates how the converts brought with them the old familiar way of regarding God, and how Mohammed inculcated a worthier estimation, and a more becoming devotion. It is no doubt a mistake to put God too far away from us, and Islam, especially in its rigid theological system, as developed after the death of Mohammed, made this mistake. But, on the other hand, familiarity breeds contempt, and the light-minded Arabs were inclined to this extreme. The old fear of the gods had largely disappeared. Mohammed renewed the fear of God by showing a God worthy of being feared, the fear of whom could become genuine reverence. The idea of this God came to him from the Bible, but colored by the Jewish or Christian conceptions current in that age. It was perhaps inevitable that his idea should fall short of the Biblical fulness. Had it been more adequate, it would perhaps have been less adapted to the people to whom he made it known. The wonder is that, unlettered as he was, himself the child of heathenism, and receiving the Biblical conception through so imperfect a medium, he was able to assimilate so much, and to present it so powerfully to his equally rude and untaught countrymen.

* *Bochari*, I., p. 187.

LECTURE V.

THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT

IN the last lecture we saw that in the system of Mohammed, God is the Ruler of the universe. He is the King, the Lord of the ages. Like the Biblical writers, Mohammed conceived this very literally. To him God is the active mover of the constellations and the seasons. Our notion of second causes or of a fixed law of nature had not entered his mind. God works by means of His creatures, but His direct command passes upon them for each of their acts. In this sense he delegates a part of His power to man. In the account of the creation of man, God says that He is about to place a vicegerent on the earth; and again: "Do you not see that God has made subservient to you what is in the heavens and what is in the earth?"* The doctrine, as you discover, is that of the Bible. Man is the ruler over nature, and nature is created for man's use and benefit.

The existence of intelligent creatures who are strictly obedient to God makes no difficulty with His government. But when we assert the freedom of these creatures, there is implied a possibility that they may act contrary to His command, and a prob-

* Koran 31¹⁰, cf. 2²⁸.

lem emerges. As soon as we assert the existence of sin the problem becomes acute. For sin is the freedom of the created will asserting itself against the will of the Creator. This is the great question with which philosophy has wrestled since first man began to reflect upon his relation to the universe.

The question assumes its largest proportions in monotheism. In polytheism there is no single will which claims to rule the sum of things. The gods are necessarily limited in power, because there are several of them. In dualism the solution is found by assuming an eternal conflict between two powers—a solution which projects the shadow of evil into the infinite both before and behind. For Mohammed, with whom we have now to deal, this solution had no attractions, and he does not betray an acquaintance with it even in his polemic.

The most religious minds seem to answer our problem by determinism—that is, they cling to the sovereignty of God and let the freedom of the creature exist only in appearance. Even in heathenism this theory asserts itself. The Greeks in their theology found room for an all-deciding fate against whom Zeus himself was powerless. The heathen Arab saw in what went on around him the working of Destiny—a power that rules the world and accomplishes its will in spite of gods and men. The Bedawy (says Wellhausen) is the independent man—“his own arm helps him, and his brother; no god assists him; he commends his soul to no saint. Allah is to him fate, and nothing more: Fate is generally spoken of without qualification—not as the decree of Allah.

But the conviction that all is decreed and predestined spurs on the Arab hero and poet to do what he has undertaken without consideration of danger. 'Fear not to march against danger, for the danger which a man tries to avoid is just the one that he meets'—the dog bites the one who is afraid of him. Fatalism, if we may call it so, does not lead the Arab to fold his hands in his bosom. On the contrary, it is the source of desperate energy—it is of no use to avoid death; therefore Forward! And, further, the certainty of death is a motive to give freely and not to be anxious for the morrow; 'I know that an evening is coming, after which no fear and no want can befall me; then I shall make the House of Truth a long visit. Why, then, should I take care for that which decays and falls into ruins? Let others foul their watering-places; I will keep my camels ready to slay for the guest.'”*

We have heard so much of *Moslem* fatalism that we are accustomed to ascribe this doctrine to Mohammed. But this extract shows that it was already current before his time. Not unlikely the popular idea of it is derived from later literature. You remember the story of Ajeeb in "A Thousand and One Nights." Ajeeb was shipwrecked on an uninhabited island. Seeing a boat approach, he screened himself from observation and watched. He saw a party land and enter a subterranean dwelling, prepared with great care. There they left a young man and departed, concealing the only door to the hiding-place. The young man is one for whom an astrologer has pre-

* Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III., p. 195.

dicted death at the hands of Ajeeb on a day certain—now near at hand. The father takes this means of protecting his son. But fate is inexorable. Against his own will, Ajeeb strikes the fatal blow and the prophecy is fulfilled to the letter. As the writer says in an apt quotation :

“We trod the steps appointed for us : and the man whose steps are appointed must tread them.

He whose death is decreed to take place in a certain land, will not die in any land but that.” *

More impressive perhaps, and preserving more of the primitive sense of that Destiny which broods over the world, are such stories as that of the City of Brass. The traveller through the desert sees in the distance a lofty city wall. He approaches it, but meets no living being. He enters its streets and walks through its palaces. Spacious halls open before him, shaded courts, lofty pavilions. But all are empty. If the inhabitants can be said to exist, they exist only in the form of statues, having been turned into stone by an inexorable decree. And the visitor fails not to find a tablet graven with an admonition which recites the shortness of life, the vanity of worldly pomp and pleasure, and the certainty of fate. He reads and is overcome by emotion. He bursts into tears or falls in a swoon. And when he recovers, he goes forth in sadness reflecting on the lot of man.†

What I am trying to show is that the fatalistic

* Lane, *A Thousand and One Nights* (1877), I., p. 136; Beirut edition of the text, I., p. 42.

† Ibid., III., p. 109 ff.

doctrine of which we now speak runs through Arab literature. It is found in the early poets ; it is found in the later story-tellers. The latter are, to be sure, influenced by the theologians, and these claim to represent the mind of Mohammed. But we must not too readily assume that they correctly represent the mind of Mohammed. It is not impossible that they are under a bias. In Islam, as in other religions, the fiercest battles have been fought over this very question of predestination and freedom. The two elements of the problem being really irreconcilable, two parties arose, according as one factor or the other was emphasized. When Greek philosophy was made known to Moslem thinkers under the Abbaside Caliphs, there came into prominence a rationalistic school of theologians called the Motazilites, that is : the Seceders. We are not here concerned with their theology in general. The point which interests us is that they denied an absolute decree or predestination on the part of God. They did this with the desire to protect the responsibility of man as a free agent, and also with the desire to establish the justice of God. For they reasoned that, if the actions of man are done in accordance with an unalterable decree, there is no justice in punishing. They call themselves therefore *believers in the Unity and Justice of God*. Their teaching on this point is set forth by a native authority* in these words : “They affirm that man has freedom and that he is the originator of his actions, both good and bad, and that he is therefore a

* Schahrastani's *Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen*, übersetzt von Dr. Th. Haarbrücker (1850), I., p. 43.

being who deserves reward and punishment in the next world for what he has done. But [they affirm] that God cannot be brought into connection with evil and unrighteousness and unbelief and disobedience [as their cause]. For as He is righteous when He brings forth righteousness, so He would be unrighteous if He were the cause of unrighteousness." So far the Motazilites. Their opponents took their stand on the divine omnipotence and did not shrink from the conclusion that God is the author of sin, and that man has no power over his own acts.* Although the school which finally prevailed tried to mediate, its members rescued for man only the semblance of freedom. The accepted Mohammedan theology is undoubtedly deterministic.

For this reason we must look with suspicion on some of the traditions which ascribe to Mohammed high predestinarianism. We have already found reason to believe that traditions were invented by the adherents of the different theological schools, in order to secure the Prophet's name for their doctrine. One such tradition, as I believe, has done much to form our idea of Moslem fatalism. It is the one given by Palgrave in these words: "When God resolved to create the human race, He took into His hands a mass of earth—the same whence all mankind were to be formed, and in which they after a manner pre-existed. Having divided the clod into two parts, He threw the one-half into hell and said: These to eternal fire and I care not; and projected the other half into heaven,

* Schahrastani, I., pp 92, 102. Dugat, *Histoire des Philosophes et des Théologiens Musulmans* (1878), p. 45.

adding: These to Paradise and I care not." * So far as this tradition makes the impression of brutal indifference on the part of God, we need not hesitate to say that it misrepresents the mind of Mohammed. The impression made by the whole body of traditions on this subject is very different. Even the one which is nearest in form to the one just quoted, and which may be a modification of the same tradition, has a different tone: "God created Adam and struck him on the right side and brought out white children—you would say they were pearls; then He struck his left side and brought out black children, you would say they were coals. Then God said: Those of the right side are towards Paradise, and I have no fear; and He said of those of the left side: They are towards hell and I have no fear." † The words translated *I have no fear* may indeed mean *I have no concern in the matter*. But they may mean also: I have no fear that their actions will not bear out what I have determined concerning them. This latter is at least a plausible interpretation, as we see from another tradition, which is given in immediate connection with the foregoing, and which is reported thus: "God took an engagement from the family of Adam, and brought out a family from the back of Adam and scattered them before Him. After that God spoke to them in his presence saying: Am not I your Creator? They said: Yes, we bear witness to Thy Godhead—

* I have cited from Hughes's *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 148, where the passage is ascribed to Palgrave, who gives the reference, *Mishcat*, Bab-ul-Qadr. I do not find the tradition in the English *Mishcat*.

† *Mishcat*, I., p. 36.

that they might not plead ignorance on the Day of Resurrection." This tradition is quite opposed to the doctrine of arbitrary election. The evident endeavor is to supply a reason for men's final sentence. The reason why the unbelievers are condemned is that they have acted contrary to the profession which they made in their pre-existent state—hence God can justly punish them for apostasy. This tradition is moreover almost identical with a Koran verse: "God took the descendants of the sons of Adam from their backs, and made them testify against themselves: Am not I your Lord? They replied: Yea, we testify. This was that you might not say at the Resurrection: We were forgetful in this matter, or should say: It was only that our fathers were idolaters aforetime and we are their posterity; wilt Thou destroy us for what the liars have done?"* We may also cite here another tradition: "Mohammed was asked about the children of idolaters, whether they would go to heaven or hell. He replied: God knows best what their actions would have been; it depends upon this." In another place he says that infants are born with natural religion; their parents give them the special turn of Jew or Christian.† Once more we are told that when a believer is examined after death, he is shown the place prepared for him in the Fire, which God has exchanged for a seat in Paradise. Here is no absolute predestination, but provision for a double possibility, the final decision depending on the actions of the individual.

Mohammed, according to these indications, was

* Koran 7¹²¹ †.

† *Bochari*, II., p. 95.

not what we should call a fatalist. In fact, he was not a systematic theologian. He knew nothing of philosophy, and the endeavor to teach it to him would probably have failed. But he was a man of religious conviction. His statements on the doctrine before us are to be interpreted by his religious, not by any dogmatic, faith. All of us who have a living faith in a living God accept His sovereignty over the universe. So far as this is in us, we interpret the experience of our daily lives in conformity with His rule over the universe. Our comfort in adversity is that our Father does all things well, and our joy in prosperity springs from the thought that it is He who is active in providing for our wants. The religious leader encourages and comforts his followers by this faith. If they lose heart, he points them to God who is able to help, and who surely will not abandon the right. If they meet misfortune, he gives them the assurance that even this is in God's plan for them. When they are successful he makes the success confirm their faith that God is working for them. In all this, emphasis is naturally laid upon the almighty power and the all-determining will of God. Mohammed's declarations on this point are to be explained along these lines. They are not philosophical propositions concerning the universal scheme of things. They are the application of a living faith to the particular circumstances of an individual experience. When his situation was gloomy or even (to human eye) desperate, he was compelled to take strong hold on the power and grace of God. He says: "Every condition is best for the believer. . . . If he is pleased, he

thanks God ; and if his condition is bad he has patience, for which he is rewarded." This is *not* the statement of a theory of the universe. It is an expression of religious trust, a trust which traces one's individual lot to the goodness of God. It reminds us of the Biblical assertion that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose.* Again we read in a tradition : " Seek for that which will benefit you, and ask God for assistance, and do not tire in so doing ; and if any misfortune befalls you do not say : If I had done so and so ; but say : God ordained it, and He does what He will—because the word *if* opens the Devil's business."† This was a practical philosophy of human life. It was not intended to be a speculative reconciliation of sovereignty and freedom.

If the speculative question was ever forced upon Mohammed, he probably declined to answer it. He came once upon a company engaged in debating about fate ; and he became angry, so that he was red in the face, and said : " Has God ordered you to debate of fate, or was I sent to you for this ? Your forefathers were destroyed for debating about fate and destiny. I adjure you not to argue on these points." ‡ This tradition seems to me much less likely to have been invented than some of the others we have been considering, and it therefore seems to me more nearly to represent the mind of the Prophet. He had no idea of laying upon the doctrine of the divine decrees the emphasis which was afterward laid upon it by the dogmatic theologians. We shall bear this in mind in

* Rom. 8²⁸.

† *Mishcat*, II., p. 517.

‡ *Ibid.*, I., p. 31.

examining the statements of the Koran—and the Koran is here, as elsewhere, our most valuable source.

At the beginning of his mission the mind of Mohammed was occupied with the great thought of the Day of Judgment. Nearly all the earliest suras dwell upon this subject. The terrors which usher in the Day are described with great variety of imagery, and these descriptions are followed by a picture of Paradise with its bliss, or of Gehenna with its torments. The implication of this whole series of revelations is that man is responsible. He is punished or rewarded for his actions, and these (we may conclude) are within his own power. The terms in which the evil-doers are described generally express an activity. When the angels say that they are sent against a people of *evil-doers*, we notice that it is an active participle of the most active form of the verb that is used. The same people are described a little later on as *transgressors*—those who pass beyond the due bounds. Thamud *turned with disdain* from the commandment of their Lord; Pharaoh, and before him, the people of the cities which were overturned for their sin, *disobeyed* the messenger of their Lord.* He who receives his book in his left hand at the Judgment has his indictment formulated in these terms: "He did not believe in God Most High, nor did he emulate others in feeding the poor."† It agrees with these words of action that jinn and men are created only *to serve God* but that they disobeyed.‡ Man was created upright, therefore, but sought out many inventions. Even where it is said that man was created with nat-

* Koran 51^{32, 34, 44}, 69⁹, 73¹⁶.

† 69³³ f.

‡ 51⁵⁶.

ural infirmities, it is implied that these do not interfere with his responsibility. The plain and obvious interpretation of these passages is in line with the declaration of Ezekiel, who rejected with indignation the thought that the children are punished for the sins of the parents, and who proclaimed with all his energy: The soul that sinneth it shall die.

We find it distinctly asserted in a second group of passages, that recompense is according to works: "Those who believe and do good works receive an unstinted reward"—"these receive a garden in which the streams flow perennially." * This is set forth figuratively in the words: "He whose scale is heavy shall have a life of delight, but he whose scale is light, his dwelling is the abyss." "On that day a man shall be told what he brought forward and what he kept back—yea a man shall be witness against himself, though he proffer his excuses."† Whether there is a specific reference here to sins of commission and sins of omission as is sometimes supposed, it cannot be doubted that the enumeration of sins is in order to a proportionate punishment. Those who are condemned will know that it is because of what they have done: "Every soul is a pledge for what it has gained—but the men of the right hand when in the garden shall ask the evil-doers: What thrust you into the Fire? They will reply: We were not in the habit of prayer and we did not feed the poor, and we used to enter into idle discourse with the vain talkers, and we used to deny the coming of the Judgment Day."‡ Quite in accord with this is the following:

* 84²⁵, 85¹¹.

† 101⁵ f, 75¹³ f. .

‡ 74⁴¹ ff.

“Has [the unbeliever] not been told of what is in the rolls of Moses and of Abraham, who was faithful, *namely* : that no soul is burdened with the burden of another, and that a man receives only that which he has wrought, and that he shall certainly be shown his work? Then shall he be recompensed with a complete recompense.”* As Mohammed professes to quote here from the earlier Scriptures we may look for a Biblical reminiscence. And we find a close parallel in a New Testament passage which declares that *each man shall bear his own burden*, and in that connection we read: “whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”

The same doctrine is virtually contained in the frequent exhortations to repent which we find in this early period. There have been preachers who called men to repentance, though convinced that men had no ability to follow the call. But we must remember that Mohammed had no theological training. With him the natural supposition is that when he called men to turn from their evil ways, they had some power of choice in the matter. So we interpret the questions addressed to the unhappy inhabitants of hell—“Why did you not believe?” or, “Why did you not reflect?” or again, “Why were you not grateful?”† Even Pharaoh has the possibility of repentance, for Moses says to him: “Wilt thou purify thyself, that I may direct thee to thy Lord and thou shalt fear Him?”‡ It is to the same effect when we find two alternatives set before man, that he may make a choice: “We led him to the two roads, but he does

* 53³⁷ ff, cf. Gal. 6^{5, 7},

† 56^{37, 62, 69}.

‡ 79¹⁹.

not climb the ascent. How wilt thou know what is the ascent? It is the setting free of the slave, and the nourishment of one's orphan kinsmen in the day of famine, or the feeding of the poor who cleaves to the dust." *

If at this period of his activity the Prophet had had the doctrine of absolute predestination in mind, it is probable that he would have asserted it in connection with some of these passages. But he does not assert it, even in expressing his idea of God's method of working. What we find emphasized is not God's decree, but His knowledge: "Does not the unbeliever know that God sees?"—"Doth he not know that when what is in the graves comes forth and what is in the breasts is brought to light, in that day their Lord will be informed concerning them?" † Another expression of the same thing is the figure of the heavenly book. There are passages in which this is apparently the book of fate, but these are later. The primary conception was of a book of record. It is said of the one who receives his book behind his back: "He thought indeed that he would not be put to grief; but his Lord was observant of him." This record is made by the angels: "And verily there are over you guardians, holy scribes who know what you do." ‡ In a passage which probably refers to the actions of men, God says: "They indeed did not fear an accounting, and accused Our revelation of falsehood. But we registered everything in a book. Taste then! We will only increase your punishment." § To the same effect are the passages already alluded

* 90¹⁰⁻¹⁶.† 96¹⁴ and 100⁹ ff.‡ 84¹⁴ f, 82¹⁰.§ 78²⁸ ff.

to, in which God is said to try men. For this period further, the assertion that God *directs* men does not mean that He exerts irresistible grace. The verb is used of one who puts travellers in the desert on the right path. He points out the road, as Moses pointed it out to Pharaoh. It does not follow that the direction will be effectual. In the early revelations, which we are now considering, God is not said to lead men astray. He knows those who go astray and He knows those who let themselves be guided,* is the utmost that is affirmed.

As we turn to the later sections of the Koran we notice first, that the view we have been considering is still affirmed: "Observe prayer and give alms; whatever good you lay up in store for yourselves you shall find in the presence of God." † The verse reminds us of the New Testament exhortation to lay up treasures in heaven. "O, you who believe, you have the care of your own souls; do yourselves no harm! Whoever goes astray after you have been rightly guided—you shall all be brought to God and He will inform you of your actions." ‡ The doctrine of recompense is here sharply asserted, and it is assumed that there is a possibility of going astray even after

* 68⁷. There is an apparent exception to this statement in 74³⁴ where God is said actively to lead astray. But this is an interpolation of a later date. In another instance (91^{7, 8}) as commonly interpreted, God is said to create the soul and inspire it with evil and with good. But as the word translated *inspired* may also mean *taught*, it is safer to suppose that the verse is no exception to the consensus of these early suras; and that the meaning is simply that God gives the soul a knowledge of good and evil.

† 2¹⁰⁴.

‡ 5¹⁰⁴.

once being guided into the right path. Again we hear: "O, Men, the truth has come to you from your Lord; whoever lets himself be guided does so to his own benefit, and whoever goes astray does so to his own hurt."* That God is a ready reckoner is frequently affirmed and also that He is just—not wronging one "even to the snapping of the fingers."† God tests men moreover, and He puts their actions upon record just as was affirmed in the earlier period.‡

But in this later period we find a distinctly more pronounced theory that God's activity extends even into the sphere of human choice. We can see to a certain extent how this problem became more complex as the Prophet advanced in his career. At first he was controlled by the great thought of the Judgment and its near approach. This thought and the consequent duty of warning men, absorbed him. For the world about him, he assumed one simple thing—that every one should repent and accept his message. But as time went on, he was perplexed not only by the delay of the Judgment—he never claimed to know its exact date—but by the obstinacy of the unbelievers. A few men recognized his mission—enough to show that there was something in his message. But the majority were rendered apparently more obstinate, for they passed from simple indifference to active hostility. The problem of the divine will and the human will assumed a practical meaning. It was now a question whether God could allow His designs to be thwarted. The little communion of Moslems

* 10¹⁰⁸.† 4¹²³.‡ 29², 54⁵².

looked to their Prophet to answer them this question. For their relief and to strengthen his own soul, he was compelled to assert that even the evil actions, unbelief, and persecutions, of the wicked are within the plan of God.

This ground was apparently taken even at Mecca. The experience at Medina only fortified the position. For at Medina an infant state was struggling into existence. The little community had frequent occasion to realize that God's ways are not as our ways. Sometimes, indeed, His care was notably manifest. But quite as often the expectations of the believers were disappointed. They were visited by fever; they suffered from famine; they were disappointed by the lukewarmness or even hostility of some in whom they trusted. The Jews were a thorn in their side. Instead of becoming converts or, at least, allies of the Prophet, they plotted against him, murmured at his claims, insinuated doubts of his mission, and provoked his followers to break the peace. It is evident that the problem of the universe was becoming more complicated.

We are able to trace the working of the Prophet's mind on one phase of this problem with considerable distinctness. In the second year after the Flight he fought a successful battle against the Meccans at a place called Bedr. As the first pitched battle of Islam, this encounter deserves a place among the decisive battles of the world; for had the Moslems been defeated it is not unlikely that their movement would have ceased to be important; and in this case the face of the world's history would have been entirely

changed. The victory was the more remarkable, in that Mohammed had only three hundred men against nine hundred and fifty of the Meccans. The decisive victory was taken at Medina to be a pledge of God's presence and approval, and at the same time as a foretaste of His judgment on His enemies. The eye of faith even saw the angels engage in the battle on the side of truth, and we may be sure that no questions were raised when the Prophet used the event as an illustration of God's will toward the believers.

The difficulty came when, a year later at Ohod, the Moslems suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the same foe, upon which they had seen the vengeance of God take effect at Bedr. On human reasoning, indeed, the defeat was easily accounted for. The Moslems were overconfident. They disregarded the advice of the wiser heads, and, instead of acting on the defensive, rushed to the conflict against large odds.* At the first appearance of success, the archers posted by Mohammed to defend his left flank deserted their station in the hope of booty. All this makes us wonder that the defeat was not more complete than it actually was. But, in any case, it was a bitter experience to men who had counted on the continued favor of God. It became necessary for Mohammed to explain the ways of God and this he does, as follows: "If you suffer from wounds, so have other peoples suffered from the like; and We make the fortune of men in battle vary, that God may know those who believe and may take from you wit-

* Seven hundred Moslems against three thousand Meccans, the latter also better armed.

nesses * (God loves not the evil-doers); and that God may try those who believe, and may destroy the unbelievers. Or do you think to enter Paradise before God knows those of you who are zealous and steadfast? . . . A soul does not die except by the permission of God [contained in] a definite decree." † The speaker then points out that God is faithful to His promise, but that the believers had been seduced by the booty and had disobeyed their leader. He then adds: "Their desires mislead them to think unjustly of God—thoughts of heathenism—in that they said: Have we any part in this affair? Say to them: The whole belongs to God. They conceal in their hearts what they do not reveal to thee, saying: If we had had our way in the matter we [that is, our brethren] had not been slain here. Say: Had ye remained in your houses, yet those whose death was decreed would have gone forth to the places where they lie, that God might search what is in your breasts and might try what is in your hearts. God knows what is in the breasts of men. As for those who turned back on the day of encounter, Satan made them slip for something which they had done. But God has pardoned them—God is forgiving and forbearing. O Believers! Be not like the unbelievers, who say concerning their brethren, when they travel or are on a raid: If they had remained with us they had not died, or they had not been slain. [This came to pass] that God might place grief in their hearts—God

* Or, *martyrs* as it is ordinarily translated. Those who die in battle are especially distinguished.

† 3¹³⁴⁻¹³⁹.

giveth life or giveth death, and God knows what you do." * Making allowance for a little incoherence, we find here a full statement of the later position of Mohammed, a position which we may summarize under two heads.

1. All comes to pass by the decree of God. He has ordained even the defeat of the believers, as He inflicted similar defeat upon other generations: "How many a prophet has there been with whom many thousands have fought, yet they did not faint at what came upon them in the cause of God, nor did they grow weak nor submit—God loves the persevering. Their only word was: Our Lord, forgive our sins and our transgressions in the cause committed to us; establish our footsteps and help us against the unbelievers." † The old point of view, that this is for the purpose of testing believers, is still held, but new points of view are opened. The decree is made more absolute. It sets the term of a man's life, so that he will go to meet death at the appointed time, no matter what efforts are made to detain him. Other men might have remained at home on the day of Ohod, but those whose death was decreed would have gone forth to the field of death in spite of all. So we find in other places: "Death will overtake you, even though you be in lofty fortresses." The book of record now becomes a book of fate: "None receives long life, and the life of no one is cut short, except it is [recorded] in a book." ‡

2. We find more distinctly affirmed that God is active in the unbelief of man. He now leads some

* 3¹⁴⁸ ff.

† 3¹⁴⁰ f.

‡ 4⁸⁰, 35¹².

astray, as well as leads some into the right path. As we had reason to suppose that His guidance is simply the pointing out of the right path, in which men are free to walk or not, we might also think that even if He presents misleading indications, men have the ability to disregard these and still to find the right path. But the weakness of man is such that when God misleads him he is sure to go wrong. In such a case there is no hope of the man, he is irrevocably lost. Such is evidently the teaching of the Koran in the period we have now reached. "If thy Lord had willed, all that are in the earth would have believed. Wilt thou then force men to believe? It is not possible for a soul to believe except by permission of its Lord." "God leads astray whom He will and leads aright whom He will; He is the Powerful, the Wise." "Whom God leads astray, for him thou wilt not find a road." "And why should you be divided concerning the hypocrites, when God has overturned them on account of what they have done? Wilt *thou* direct those whom God has led astray?"* Yet, although the action of God may be supposed to be irresistible in such cases, we find a certain synergism (to use a theological term) allowed. Man co-operates in his own salvation, and man also has part in his own destruction. God conducts to Himself *him who repents*,† but the wicked are not directed because they will not be: "How shall God guide aright a

* 10³⁹ f, 14ⁱ, 4¹⁴², 90, cf. 76²⁹ f, "Whoever will, let him take the path to his Lord; but ye *will not* unless God wills," and Jno. 12³⁹: "Therefore they could not believe."

† 42¹².

people who disbelieve after once believing and testifying that the Apostle is true, when [also] evident proofs have come to them? God will not guide the people who do evil." *

On this last point we find a variety of statements. In some cases men are said to be blinded by the seductions of the world: "Cease from those who use their religion as a sport and a pastime, whom the life of the world has beguiled; and remind them that a soul is corrupted by what it has acquired." † But this life of the world is ordained of God for this purpose. Moses prays thus: "O Lord, Thou hast given Pharaoh and his nobles pomp and riches in this world *to make them wander* from Thy path; Our Lord, destroy their riches and harden their hearts, that they may not believe until they see exemplary punishment." ‡ In other passages God is more directly active on the hearts of the wicked: "There are those who come to listen to thee, but on whose hearts *We have placed veils* lest they should understand, and in whose ears deafness; and if they should see every kind of sign they would not believe in it—so that they would [even then] come disputing with thee and saying: Verily this is nought but old wives' fables." "These are they whose hearts and hearing and sight *God has sealed*: they are the heedless and without doubt they shall be the losers in the world to come." And again: "When thou recitest the Koran, We place between thee and those who do not believe in the world to come, a thick veil, and We have placed on their hearts coverings that they may not under-

* 380.

† 669, 130.

‡ 1038.

stand, and in their ears deafness; and when thou namest thy Lord, the Only One, in the recitation, they turn away in disgust." * In these and other passages we must not lose sight of the possibility that God's activity is conceived of as the infliction of *judicial blindness*. By the divine ordering, the man's sin becomes a cause of further sin: "That which they have done has covered their hearts" we read in one place; and again: "We turn away their hearts and eyes [from the truth] *because* they do not believe in it at the first, and We leave them to wander about in their disobedience." †

On the other hand, Satan is the agent who brings men into sin, though not without the divine permission. He himself was tried by God and disobeyed. He then asked a reprieve from his sentence for a time, that he might become the tempter of men. He received permission and began his career with our first parents: "Satan made them slip from Paradise and brought them out from the place where they were." ‡ And he is still active: "Those of you who turned their backs in the day of encounter—this was only because Satan caused them to slip, for something which they had done." § The passage is noteworthy because the new temptation was a penalty for sin already committed. But whatever takes place, all is so thoroughly in the plan of God that He is said to have created men for this purpose: "If thy Lord had willed He would have made mankind one people. But [as it is] they will not cease disputing,

* 6²⁵, 16¹¹⁰, 17⁴¹ ff.

† 2³⁴.

‡ 83¹⁴, 6¹¹⁰.

§ 3¹⁴⁹.

except the one on whom thy Lord has mercy. And for this He created them, and the word of thy Lord shall surely be accomplished [to wit]: "Verily I will fill Gehenna with men and with jinn." *

If what has been said is correct, we must admit that Mohammed held both sides of the doctrine we are considering. He had the religious sense which affirms God's absolute sovereignty; at the same time he had the moral sense which declares man's responsibility for his sin and the justice of his punishment. The latter judgment was more prominent in his earlier life, the other was added to it at a later time. But at no time was he a fatalist, for we mean by fatalism the assertion of God's activity to the entire extinction of human freedom. In holding on to the two apparently contradictory propositions, he was in line with most religious leaders—certainly in line with the Biblical writers. Every one of the sentences quoted from the Koran can be paralleled by a verse from the Bible. The prophets, as preachers of righteousness, emphasize the self-origination of the sinner's acts. They describe the evil-doers in the same terms of activity which we have read in the Koran. Israel is "a sinning nation . . . children who corrupt their way; they have forsaken Yahweh, they have rejected the Holy One of Israel, they have estranged themselves, turning backward."† Elsewhere the wicked are described as violent, as corrupters, as oppressors, as shedders of blood, as transgressors of the commandments. The resemblance to the terms cited above is striking. Another parallel is in the call to repent and in the

* 11¹²⁰, cf. 32¹³.

† Is. 1⁴.

assertion of the justice of God, both which could be abundantly illustrated by quotation. God's knowledge of men's actions is spoken of in almost the same terms employed by Mohammed—including the book of record: "I saw a great white throne and Him that sat upon it, from whose face earth and heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened . . . and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works."* So thoroughly had Mohammed adopted the Biblical idea that we should have no sense of incongruity were we to find this passage incorporated bodily in the Koran. In this, as in some other matters that we have considered, he had apprehended and adopted the Biblical position.

And in his later doctrine he was also in line with Biblical assertions. The perplexities which beset him were not unlike what the Prophets of Israel met. It seems ludicrous to compare the battle of Ohod to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar. And yet, on a small scale, the battle of Ohod was a test of faith to the infant Islam quite similar in its effects to the capture of Jerusalem as it appeared to believing Hebrews. The Prophets were driven in this great crisis to take a firmer hold on God as the ruler of the universe. They were compelled to clarify their view of the test imposed by calamity; and they came out of the conflict with the conviction that if God's ways are not our ways, this is because His ways are

* Rev. 20¹¹⁻¹³.

higher than our ways. Mohammed's declarations are a weaker echo of these. But they are enough to show that he had apprehended and appropriated their thought.

In other particulars than those just mentioned we may discover Biblical influence. The sinner's destruction of himself, for example, is affirmed in those passages which speak of him that digs a pit and falls into it himself, or of him whose violence comes down on his own head. Again: it is "because men do not like to retain God in their knowledge" that God gives them up to a reprobate mind.* If men are said in the Koran to be beguiled by the world so they are in the New Testament: "The cares of the world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the Word."† In both documents also, Satan is the tempter. Where the part of God is prominently in the mind of the Biblical writer, he does not hesitate to say that God blinds those who sin. Isaiah is commanded: "Make the heart of this people fat [that is, stupid] and make their ears heavy, and shut [literally, plaster over] their eyes, lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart, and turn again and be healed."‡ The Biblical passage goes beyond Mohammed in making the blindness an effect of the preaching. The familiar texts which speak of God's hardening men's hearts also have their parallel in the Koran, and to the declaration of the latter that God leads men astray we may compare: "Why, O Yahweh, dost Thou make us to wander from Thy way—dost harden our hearts so as not to fear

* Rom. 1²⁸.† Matt. 13²².‡ Is. 6¹⁰.

Thee.”* Finally, the purpose to fill Gehenna with men and jinn reminds us that the wicked are sent to the eternal fire *prepared* for the devil and his angels.†

Our consideration of the divine government up to this point has been mainly occupied with the problem of sovereignty and freedom. Concerning these, we find that Mohammed holds positions strictly analogous to those held by Biblical writers. He had apprehended the Biblical doctrine. Before leaving the subject we may briefly consider his doctrine of demons and angels. For it is evident that these also are subjects of the government of God, and their activity furnishes problems similar to those presented by the freedom of man. In its strong sense of the reality of intelligent beings other than man, Islam is in line with mediæval Christianity and Judaism. With the luxuriant fancy which has crowded Arabic literature with superhuman agencies we have nothing to do. But so far as they form a part of Moslem religion we cannot pass them by.

Arabic heathenism peopled the desert with a class of beings called collectively *jinn* (the singular is *jinnee*). We have no word which is exactly equivalent, so that it is best to retain the Arabic term. The belief in the jinn goes back to the time when animals were an object of superstitious reverence. The word *jann* ‡ is applied in the Koran to serpents, and the identity of serpents and jinn was endorsed by Mohammed himself. At least a tradition tells us of a

* Is. 63¹⁷.

† Matt. 25⁴¹.

‡ Used also interchangeably with *jinn*. The passage is 28³¹.

young Moslem who on return from the wars had this experience: He found his young wife standing outside the house, and in jealous anger lifted his spear against her. She told him to enter the house and see what had driven her forth. He entered and found a serpent coiled upon the bed. Transfixing it with the spear he brought it into the court, where it writhed awhile about the shaft and then died. But at the same time the young man who was holding the spear also fell dead, though not having received a visible wound. Mohammed on being questioned declared that this was a *jinn*, and that many such who were true believers came into the houses of the Moslems. The proper method of treating them, he said, was politely to entreat their departure. Only after three days (the time for which it is obligatory to entertain a guest) was it lawful to use violence against them. We see that the line between animals and demons (in the Greek sense) was not clearly drawn.

Of the belief in this class of beings in the primitive Semitic religion we have traces in the Old Testament. The satyrs who danced among the ruins are clearly allied to the jinn, and so are the *shedim* which we have already had occasion to mention. In the account of the battle of Ohod a jinn named *Hairy-heels* is said to have proclaimed the death of Mohammed. As the satyrs of the Hebrew are also hairy beings, this is a noteworthy coincidence. The night monster Lilith which is mentioned with the satyrs and which later Judaism classed with the Ghûl belongs in the same company, and so does Azazel of whom we hear

in the book of Leviticus.* Mohammed had therefore a precedent for retaining this popular superstition in his religion. It enabled him plausibly to account for some things in heathenism, as we have already seen; and it furnished a basis for the more complete scheme of angels and devils which he adopted from Judaism and Christianity.

The early Church had an elaborate theory concerning angels and demons. An authority on Church history defines the position of the Fathers as follows: "In regard to the heavenly spirits who belong to the upper world, and in fact constitute it, the orthodox Fathers hold fast to the following points: (1) that they were created by God; (2) that they are endowed with freedom but are without material bodies; (3) that they had passed through a probation in which part of them had persevered in good, others had fallen; (4) that the good spirits are organs of the divine government, and their actions are useful and helpful to man and, indeed, belong to the means of grace; (5) that the actual evil in the world is to be attributed to the evil spirits, especially to their chief, the Devil, and that these have almost unbounded power on earth, but can only *tempt* man to sin, not compel him; and that they can be put to flight by the name of Christ, the sign of the cross, and the sacraments."† This describes exactly the position of Mohammed except that, for the means of defence here named, he would substitute *prayer*. This scheme

* Cf. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 113 ff. The Biblical references are Lev. 17⁷, Deut. 32¹⁷, Is. 13²¹, 34¹⁴, Ps. 106³⁷.

† Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., p. 125 f.

was combined with the belief in the jinn in such a way that it is not always easy to distinguish between the various classes of supernatural beings. Sometimes all are classed as jinn. Iblis is said to be an angel and he is also said to be of the jinn.* In general, however, the angels appear to be of higher rank.

From the allusions to the jinn in the Koran we make out that Mohammed carried into their world the division of believers and unbelievers. They, like men, were created to serve but have disobeyed, and their reprobation is described in the same terms as the reprobation of men: "We have created for Gehenna a great number of the jinn and of mankind, who have hearts with which they do not comprehend, and who have eyes with which they do not see, and who have ears with which they do not hear—they are like the brutes, yea, even more wayward: these are the heedless." † The enmity of the evil ones among them toward mankind, shows itself in leading men to idolatry: "In the day when He shall gather them together [He shall say]: O people of the jinn, you have had too much advantage from men. Then will their devotees say: Our Lord, we profited each other, and we have reached the term Thou has set for us. Then will He reply: The Fire is your abode forever." ‡

We have already noticed the Biblical parallel to this doctrine. Another point of resemblance is the theory of demoniacal possession. The *Kahin* or soothsayer in heathen Arabia spoke under the influence of a jinn. The Old Testament belief that a man could

* Koran 2³², 7¹⁰, 18¹⁵.

† 7¹⁷³.

‡ 6¹²⁸.

prophecy by means of a familiar spirit is well known. It is also well known that to the present day in Mohammedan countries an insane person is supposed to be possessed by a jinnee. No clear line can here be drawn between the jinn and the Satans. The latter, however, are certainly borrowed from the older religions. Their chief is Iblis, whose name is a corruption of *Diabolos*, and therefore from a Christian source. Iblis was an angel; he refused to bow to man because he was created of fire, while man was created of clay—therefore, in his view, man was the inferior. For this disobedience he was banished from Paradise. In his further career, he became the tempter of man, and will continue to practise his arts until the final Judgment. The Satans are his helpers: “They turn men from the path, when these think they are guided aright.”* We are told that Satan says to a man: Disbelieve! “But when he disbelieves [Satan] says: Verily I am innocent of thy transgressions: I fear God, the Lord of the worlds.” In the New Testament also we hear of devils who believe and shudder. Satan tried Job by sending calamities upon him.† Although he has no power over those who commit themselves to God,‡ he insinuates evil thoughts into the minds of believers when they are careless, so that he made even Mohammed forget part of his message.§ “He makes promises and excites desires, but Satan promises only in order to deceive.”|| All this is done in order to destroy men, though it is not done without the permission of God; and God’s aim in permitting it, is to prove men’s faith and steadfast-

* 43³⁶.† 38⁴⁰⁻⁴².‡ 16¹⁰¹.§ 6⁶⁷.|| 4¹¹⁹.

ness. That this is in accord with New Testament teaching, I need not stop to point out.* The mind of Mohammed, like that of the Biblical writers, was concerned with this as a practical matter. He, like they, saw in the temptation to sin an evil personality arrayed against the believer. Satan is a wolf to a man, "as a wolf to the sheep which seizes one separated from the flock"†—just as in the New Testament he is a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour.

And if we find the Biblical doctrine adopted for this class of beings, so we find it adopted for their counterpart, the angels. These were created to adore God, and they fulfil the purpose of their creation: "To Him belongs what is in heaven and on earth, and they who are in His presence are not too proud to serve Him, nor do they tire; they utter praise by night and by day and do not cease."‡ How thoroughly Biblical this is, we see from Isaiah's vision (where the Seraphim adore God) and from several

* An extra-Biblical assertion is that Solomon had power over the demons. This apparently comes from a Jewish source, though Geiger points out nothing earlier than the Second Targum to Esther.

While on this subject I may mention a theory which appears in the Koran, that the shooting stars are heavenly darts thrown to drive away the jinn who lurk near heaven to get information (Kor. 37⁶ f). A Christian source is pointed out by Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, VIII., p. 117) in the words of Tertullian: "Since the demons dwell in the air, near the stars, and in connection with the clouds, they know what is preparing there, and so are able to prophesy." In the clear air of Arabia, the shooting stars naturally fitted into this view.

† *Mishcat*, I., p. 51.

‡ 21¹⁹ f.

passages in the Apocalypse. It is probably a reminiscence of Isaiah's vision when the angels are described as having two, three, or four pair of wings.* They carry the throne of God, as do the living creatures of Ezekiel's vision.† They are, moreover, the messengers of God and the organs of revelation; and the Biblical influence goes so far that Mohammed borrows the names Gabriel and Michael. In the traditions it is uniformly Gabriel who brings the Koran, and this is apparently the mind of the Prophet, though only once in the Koran itself does he name Gabriel in connection with the revelations. You will remember that Gabriel appears in the New Testament as the bringer of God's messages.

Besides this, the angels have charge of the believer: "Each one has attendants who succeed each other, who guard him by the command of God."‡ They keep the record of man's actions: "When the two beings meet seated at the right and left [of a man], he does not utter a word that there is not for it a watcher ready."§ They are especially interested in the believer's worship. When one is praying in the mosque, the angels do not cease interceding for him, and the Amen of the leader in worship is taken up and repeated by them.|| In heaven they intercede for the believers: "The angels repeat the praise of their Lord and ask pardon for those on earth."¶ This goes further than the Biblical statements, which only say in general that the angels have charge over the believer and minister to him.** But the develop-

* Koran 35¹. † 40⁷, 69¹⁷. ‡ 13¹². § 50¹⁶ f.

|| *Bochari*, I., pp. 146, 170. ¶ Koran 42³. ** Ps. 91¹¹, Heb. 1¹⁴.

ment is the same which we find in post-Biblical Christianity.

The results of our inquiry may be summed up in a very few words. In Mohammed we see the religious conception of a single Ruler of the universe united with the moral conception of the Supreme Judge. Without attempting to reconcile these, the Prophet does not hesitate to affirm them and to apply them to his own circumstances. He extends them also to the extra-human communities which he adopts partly from Arabic tradition, and partly from Jewish and Christian belief. Throughout, he shows dependence on Biblical ideas though without verbal quotation of Biblical language.

LECTURE VI.

REVELATION AND PROPHECY

THE present lecture will examine conceptions fundamental to all religions, at least to all the higher religions. Granted the existence of a God, how is His will made known to man? It is obvious that He does not speak audibly to all men. Although He makes Himself known in nature, the majority of mankind are too blind or too heedless to attend to this word. If men are to know God they must have a more distinct message. And this message is given by the voice of men to whom God has communicated it, and whom He calls to the office of His heralds. The doctrine of such a message is fully adopted in Islam. Along-side of the declaration that there is no God but Allah, we hear the equally emphatic declaration that Mohammed is the Apostle of Allah. Mohammed so described himself, having borrowed the title, as well as the idea, from the earlier revealed religions.

The conception of prophecy is, in the case of Mohammed, complicated by the further idea that the revelations given by a prophet constitute a book. The two do not necessarily go together. Take the earlier prophets of Israel. Elijah and Elisha seem to have felt no impulse to put their utterances into permanent form. Their expectation was probably the

same to which the Book of Deuteronomy gives expression—that God would provide a succession of prophets for His people. Their guidance would be continuous and constant; the people would always be able to appeal to a living organ of revelation. God would always be in touch with them and they with Him.

Curiously enough the publication of the very Book which formulated this expectation of a constant succession of prophets, introduced another conception, which has now displaced the former both in Judaism and in Christianity. Instead of looking to the man of God and inquiring: what saith the Lord?—we now open the pages of the Book of God and inquire: what do we find written? The spoken word of God has become the recorded Book of God. Mohammed received the idea in this form. With him revelation and Scripture belonged together. Allow me to show this in a few words.

In the first place, it is very doubtful whether Mohammed himself could read or write. The question has been debated more fully than its importance warrants. The zealous Moslem is very willing to argue that he could not, because the miracle of the Koran seems thereby to be made the greater. Modern scholars, whose culture is inseparably connected with books, cannot conceive of a man of such influence being ignorant. All that we know is, that when Mohammed had occasion to write, he employed an amanuensis, and that in one place in the Koran he is addressed thus: “Thou wast not accustomed before this to read a book nor to write with thy right hand—then the deceivers

were in doubt." * As in the immediate context he is speaking of sacred books, he may mean no more than that he had not been a reader of such books; though the general terms which he uses naturally imply that he had no acquaintance with any books.

But if we hesitate to draw this conclusion, and so leave the general question undecided, we may yet accept the plain statement of the passage: Until a time when he was fairly launched upon his career, Moham-med had not read the Bible.

This conclusion is confirmed by the contents of the Koran. Although (as we have seen) a large part of this book is derived ultimately from the Bible, yet in no instance does it show, on the part of the author, such exact knowledge as would come from the study, or even the reading, of its text. He makes but one or two quotations from it. Even when he professes to give the substance of certain parts of it—as the covenant between God and Israel—he reproduces them very imperfectly. The stories he takes from it, vary in a multitude of details from their originals. He makes gross chronological blunders, as where he identifies the Virgin Mary with the Old Testament Miriam. He so misunderstood Judaism that he says the Jews make Ezra the son of God—something which even superficial acquaintance with the Old Testament would have prevented. In a tradition it is related that when he built his mosque at Medina, he was asked

* Koran, 29.¹ Those who wish to see a fuller discussion of Mohammed's literary attainments may consult Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Korans*, p. 8; Goldziher, *Die Zahiriten*, p. 171; Sprenger, *Leben des Muhammed*, II., p. 398.

why he did not make it of more substantial materials. He replied: "My temple shall be like the tabernacle of Moses, which was made of wood and straw."*

All the evidence, then, goes to show that Mohammed's acquaintance with the Bible came from oral communication with Jews and Christians. Although our knowledge of Mecca during Mohammed's early life is very imperfect we are tolerably certain that there was no considerable number of either Jews or Christians there. Of the Jews at Medina we have ample knowledge, and if there had been either synagogue or church at Mecca the fact would doubtless have been preserved by tradition. All that tradition tells us is that there were a very few Christians at Mecca, the most of them slaves. It speaks also of Waraka, a cousin of Chadija, Mohammed's first wife, who was a Christian "and accustomed to write the Gospels in Hebrew"—by which, no doubt, Syriac is meant. This Waraka is made by tradition to recognize Mohammed as a prophet at the very beginning of his career; and it is possible that such a man existed, and that he influenced Mohammed.† But the desire of tradition to secure Christian recognition and endorsement for Mohammed is so strong, that we are obliged to be cautious in receiving this account as though it was a historic fact. More weight may be allowed to the assertion that there were Christian slaves‡ at Mecca to whom Mohammed's attention was called by their chanting of the Scriptures.

* Sprenger, III., p. 14. Cf. Koran 2⁷⁷, 9³⁰.

† On Waraka, cf. *Bochari*, I. p. 3.

‡ Muir refers to three such slaves all of whom became Moslems,

Let us imagine a religious inquirer led to converse with such slaves. We may assume that they had no Arabic translation of the Bible. Their Bible was probably in Syriac. Besides this, it is extremely unlikely that they had any books, even Syriac books, in their possession. Books were a rare commodity and not owned by slaves. But Christian slaves would have some knowledge of the Bible, especially of those parts of the Bible most frequently used in the public service. This would include the Psalms and Gospels quite certainly, for these were used in the churches from very early times. Let us suppose their knowledge to be limited in amount and crude in quality. The question with us is: What effect would their use of Scripture have upon an inquirer like Mohammed?

For one thing it would satisfy a want of his soul. We can hardly help supposing that he was already religiously awakened. He was dissatisfied with the ancestral religion and longing for something better. This desire would lead him to inquire for a worthy service of God. Liturgy is an important part of every religion. Mohammed is dissatisfied with heathenism; he is seeking a way in which to serve God. He comes across these young men and hears their chant. Asking what it means, he is told that they are celebrating the praises of God. On further inquiry he is told that the words they use are forms supplied by God Himself from His holy Book. It seems to me that he would recognize in this service

Life of Mahomet, II., p. 122. It is interesting to note that Zaid, who may be called a forerunner of Mohammed, was exercised about the right way to worship God. — *Ibn Hisham*, I., p. 108.

just what he was looking for ; that he would find this an entirely worthy service, and would have a great desire to adopt such a service for himself.

Now tradition assures us that for some time before his call, Mohammed used to retire to a cave near Mecca, and give himself, for days at a time, to exercises of devotion. It does not seem fanciful to suppose that he was endeavoring to serve God after the manner just described. In this endeavor we can see that he would meet with some perplexities. The service of Jews and Christians, he had learned, is based upon a divine book. This book was inaccessible to him. If he could get a copy it would be useless to him because in a foreign language. The broken Arabic of his Christian friends would be inadequate in form. In this perplexity, he would naturally throw himself upon God. If God in His mercy would only send him portions of His Book, as He had sent portions to the prophets, how gladly would he receive them and use them in a service of praise !

Such desires would raise the further question—why may not God send an Arabic prophet ? To Mohammed all the world was organized in tribes like those of Arabia. The tribe of the Jews had been favored by God with more than one prophet. The tribe of the Christians had had Jesus. It would not be strange if Arabia should be visited by the divine grace. If such a prophet were to arise he would be furnished with such divinely appointed liturgical compositions as the Psalms. Not that Mohammed would lay any special stress upon their being written down. His conception of a book was not like ours. We think of

a book as something to be read in a quiet corner, and studied, and pondered over. To him a book was a repository of words that were to be *read aloud* or *recited*. If its contents were known by heart, the written document was unnecessary.

As we well know, Mohammed called his revelations *Koran*. A single chapter is a *Koran*, and the whole collection is the *Koran*. The verb from which this name is derived does not mean *to read* in our sense, but to *read aloud*, to *recite*, or to *chant*—precisely the act which is performed in the public service of the Church, the Synagogue, and the Mosque. The presence or absence of a written exemplar makes no difference. The recitation is a *qur'an* just the same. The words recited may be called a book, even although they are not committed to paper. Mohammed makes the infant Jesus in the cradle speak and describe himself thus: "I am the servant of God, He has given me the Book and made me a prophet." * It would be absurd to suppose the new-born babe holding a material book in his hand. What is meant is that the infant prophet had the truth *in his heart*. With this agrees the description of the *Koran* as "clear verses *in the breasts* of those who have received knowledge"; and in another passage the revelation is sent *upon the heart* of the Prophet himself that he should become one of the warners.†

Let us look now at the tradition of the call of Mohammed. We must use it with a certain reserve, for Ayesha, from whom it is received, was only eighteen years old at the time of her husband's death, and the

* *Koran*, 19³¹.

† 29¹⁸, 26¹⁹¹.

event of which she speaks took place before her birth. All she could have heard was Mohammed's recollections of his call; and whether she was capable of understanding clearly what he attempted to describe, or of repeating his account without additions suggested by her own lively imagination, is a question. However, the information is the best we have, and we must make the best we can out of it. It reads as follows:

"The first of the revelations which came to the Apostle of Allah was a good dream; and he did not have a dream without there coming something like the break of day. Then he liked to be alone and he used to go to the cave of Hira and purify himself—this [purification] was a performance of religious exercises several nights—until he desired [to return to] his family. And he used to provide himself with food for these periods and did so again and again, until [finally] the truth came to him. And he was in the cave of Hira, and the angel came to him and said: Recite! He replied: I cannot recite.* Then, said he [that is, Mohammed] he took hold of me and squeezed me to the utmost of my endurance. Then he let me go and said again: Recite!" The same answer was given and the same action repeated a second and a third time. At the last the angel repeated these verses, which now constitute a part of the Koran:

"Recite in the name of thy Lord who created,
Created man from a clot of blood;
Recite! Thy Lord is bountiful;

* Literally: *I am not a reciter.*

He who has taught man by the pen :
Taught him what he did not know.
But man is rebellious
As soon as he sees himself becoming rich ;
Yet verily to thy Lord they shall return ! ” *

The verses are in rhymed prose—a form which extends throughout the Koran. We should note however that in the earlier suras we have a much nearer approach to a regular metre than in the later compositions. In the revelation before us, the verses are nearly equal in length and also short, so that the rhyme and the rhythm strike the ear at once. These early suras are all well adapted for the cantillation or intonation which prevails in the public service of the Oriental Church as well as in that of the Synagogue.

It must be confessed that the account of Mohammed's call is not altogether clear. But the main facts seem worthy of credence. The first of these is that Mohammed was deeply concerned on the subject of religion. This is evidenced by his frequent and prolonged visits to the lonely cave. There is a tradition which even affirms that his religious anxiety brought him to the verge of suicide. If this be true, it only shows more clearly the depth of his emotion. The next fact indicated is that he had a vision of the night. This is not the only indication that his early revelations were received in the night. For the present it is sufficient to note that tradition brings his earliest experience of this kind into connection with a vivid dream. Lastly we notice that the vision brings him something which we suppose he would greatly desire,

* Koran, 96¹⁻⁸.

that is, a form which he could use for the worship of God.

The endeavor to make the experiences of a religious mind psychologically intelligible is one frequently made but rarely successful. It is doubtful whether if we could cross-question Mohammed himself, we could explain all his experiences. But tentatively we may be allowed to construct from the data before us a story such as he would tell us, and which would be logically consistent. We suppose him anxious on the subject of religion, convinced that the one true God does reveal Himself to His servants, and possessed by a strong desire to know His way more perfectly. With this on his mind Mohammed spends days in his cave, meditating on these things and calling upon God. At last in the midst of the little sleep he allows himself, he has a vivid dream. A bright light seems to break upon him. He sees a radiant form, which speaks and gives him what he has sought. The evidence of the truth of the vision is the stanza which remains in his memory after he awakes, a form of words which he can use in the praise of his Lord. If this were Mohammed's experience it was an experience which brings him into the company of many others. For many seekers after truth and beauty have confessed that after long striving—a striving which has brought them to despair—the object of their search has come to them suddenly like the rising of the dawn.

The next sura in point of time is said to be one that begins: "O Thou who art wrapped in a garment!" Tradition has fastened on these words, and has invented a situation for them. It tells us that

Mohammed was subject to epileptic fits, and that, when he felt these coming on, he would have Chadija wrap him in a covering so that he would be protected from the air, or from the gaze of curious visitors. On the basis of this tradition a modern scholar * has built up an elaborate theory of Mohammed's epileptic or hysterical disease. But the foundation is insufficient. The tradition is built upon the single phrase just quoted which describes the one addressed as wrapped in a garment. But every oriental wraps himself in a garment when he lies down to sleep. All that we can legitimately conclude from the words is that the revelation came to the Prophet when he was asleep. "Awake, thou that sleepest!" is the natural meaning of the address, and we have here another evidence that these earlier revelations came as visions of the night. The famous night journey to Jerusalem is evidence in the same direction.†

Because his first visions were visions of the night, it does not follow that all the later ones were of the same kind. The statements are many to the effect that the Prophet had visions also in his waking hours. He would become apparently unconscious; breathed heavily; the perspiration broke out upon him even in a wintry day.‡ After such a fit, he would give an answer to a question that had perplexed him, or would recount a vision that he had seen. How far

* Sprenger in his *Leben und Lehre des Muhammed*.

† The night visit is alluded to 17¹. It should be noted that two suras (73 and 74) begin with an address to the one wrapped in a garment.

‡ *Bochari*, I., p. 3, II., pp. 117, 132, 186; *Vakidi* (Wellhausen), p. 181.

he was subject to physical disease, and how far these extraordinary states may be explained as the result of mental excitement, is difficult to say. We can readily see the strong emotion which any one would feel at the approach of a heavenly messenger. Any man of ordinary sensibility, if convinced that he was about to receive a superhuman revelation, would become excited, and his emotion might produce physical effects such as are here described for us. In order to account for them, it is not necessary to suppose either that Mohammed was epileptic or that he was playing a part.

It is to our present purpose to point out that, both in the matter of dreams and of waking visions, Mohammed's experience was similar to that of the Biblical organs of revelation. The importance of dreams is evident upon the face of the Old Testament narrative. Jacob has a decisive revelation in a dream. Joseph's dreams foreshadowed God's dealings with him. The author of the Book of Job assumes that God speaks to men "in thoughts from the visions of the night when deep sleep falleth on men." So in the New Testament; the angel which encouraged Paul stood by him in the night, the most natural interpretation of the words being that he appeared in a dream. Without laying stress upon the cases where the dream is sent to startle the unbeliever (as Pharaoh or Nebuchadrezzar) it is clearly made out that, to the Old Testament writers, the dream was one method of revelation. Jeremiah, to be sure, speaks slightly of dreams and seems to contrast them with the voice which came to the prophet. But this we must

explain as a reaction against the abuse of dreams by the prophets of his time.

And if the waking vision produced extraordinary physical manifestations, or was accompanied by extraordinary physical manifestations in Mohammed, the same is seen in the Old Testament prophets. Balaam speaks of himself as falling down when he had the vision of the Almighty. Ezekiel fell upon his face when he saw the chariot of glory. So did Daniel at the appearance of Gabriel; and John, when he had a revelation of the Son of Man, fell at his feet like one dead. The phenomena are strikingly alike, though a direct connection does not seem to exist.

But it is time to look beyond these externals to the substance of Mohammed's revelations. What was it to which he was called? To answer this question we may look at one or two of these early chapters. One has been already quoted. Another, to which allusion has been made, reads as follows:

“ O, thou who art wrapped in a garment ;
Rise and warn !
And magnify thy Lord,
And cleanse thy garments,
And flee iniquity !
And do not spend with the desire of gain ;
And wait patiently for thy Lord !
When a blast is blown upon the trumpet
That will be a distressful day,
Not easy for the unbelievers. ” *

* Koran, 74¹⁻¹⁰. The rhyme changes in the next verse, so that this section is probably a revelation by itself.

The message is evidently a command to preach. "Arise and warn" is its key-note. The rest is interpreted by this. In order to warn, he must himself be an example of faith. That is, he must worship in an acceptable manner, purifying his garments and calling upon the name of his Lord. It is this which was emphasized in the first revelation. The Prophet is there called upon to recite the praises of God, that is, to spend the time in worship. In both, the command is motived by the thought of the approaching judgment. Man is rebellious and will be brought to an account. The trumpet will be blown and a distressful day ensue. These are evidently reasons for the command to warn men of their danger. In this respect, the call of Mohammed is like the call to the Old Testament prophets. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the prophets in general, are sent to rebuke a sinful nation, to declare the wrath of God, and to threaten approaching calamity.

If we desire further light upon what Mohammed felt called to do, we may examine others of his early compositions, for we may be sure that in them he tries to carry out the command of God. What we find on such examination is, that some of these are forms of prayer. Thus :

" Praise be to God, Lord of the Ages,
The Compassionate, the Merciful,
King of the Day of Judgment :
Thee we serve and to Thee we cry for help,
Lead us in the straight path,
The path of those to whom Thou art gracious,
Upon whom is no wrath and who do not stray." *

* Koran, 1, the well known *Fatiha*.

A profession of faith is a part of worship, so that we put here the following :

“ God is one,
The Self-existent ;
He begets not and is not begotten,
And none is equal to Him.” *

Evidently designed to be used in worship are some others, as the fifty-fifth, which with its recurring refrain reminds us of Psalm 136. Far more numerous are the addresses designed to warn men of their danger. For example :

“ The desire of gain absorbs you,
Until you visit the tomb.
Yet you shall certainly know,
Then shall you certainly know !
Nay ! If you knew with clear knowledge
You would certainly see the flame ;
Then would you see it with clear eye,
In that day you shall be asked concerning
your pleasures.” †

This one is somewhat vague in its description of the expected punishment, though it is interesting for its accusation of covetousness as the root of men's evil actions. Usually the judgment is depicted with vividness, as in the following :

“ When the heavens shall open,
And shall hear their Lord and obey ;
When the earth shall be laid flat,
And shall cast away what is in it and be empty,
And shall hear its Lord and obey—

* Koran, 112.

† 102.

O, man though thou strive hard against thy Lord, yet
shalt thou meet Him.

And he who receives his book in his right hand
Shall be judged leniently,

And shall return to his friends with joy.

But he who receives his book behind his back
Shall wish for annihilation,

And shall suffer the Fire.

Once he rejoiced amid his friends—

He thought he should not be moved.

Yet verily, thy Lord was observing him.

.

But what ails them, that they do not believe?

And, when the Scripture is recited, do not bow?

The unbelievers even accuse it of being false!

But God knoweth their secret thought.

Therefore bring them tidings of a severe punishment,

But those who believe and do well receive an unstinted
reward." *

These citations are enough to show what Mohammed understood to be his mission. He had received a call to worship God and to preach. This call he obeyed to the best of his ability. Doubtless he had some shrinking before appearing in public, as is indicated in the tradition—where the angel uses force before he secures obedience. In this also he will be found in line with the Biblical prophets. Moses seeks to be excused from the work to which he is called, on the ground of inability to speak, and Jeremiah pleads his youth as a reason why he should not be sent to Judah. This is, of course, a natural experience; we can hardly suppose that Mohammed was influenced here by his Biblical knowledge.

* Koran, 84.

In his later life, however, he elaborated the theory of revelation more distinctly, and in the additional details we can clearly trace Biblical ideas. Up to this point we have had only tradition to go upon, for the mode of revelation. For the later period we have more positive assertions in the Koran. As to the objective reality of what he saw he never had any doubt. But he was sometimes obliged to assure his followers of it. So we have a description of his experiences in the following :

“ By the Pleiades when they set !
 Your fellow-citizen is not astray or erring.
 He does not speak his own fancy.
 [What he speaks] is a revelation sent to him.
 The Mighty in power taught it to him
 The Possessor of strength. He stood erect
 In the upper horizon ;
 Then he drew near and condescended,
 And was two bows' lengths [from him] or nearer.
 And he made known to his servant what he made known.
 The heart did not deceive concerning what it saw ;
 And will you dispute concerning what he saw ?
 He saw him another time,
 By the *sidra* tree of the border,
 Near which is the garden of abode ;
 Then covered the *sidra* tree that which covered it,
 The eye did not turn aside nor refuse [to look],
 And he saw the greatest of the signs of his Lord.” *

The language is obscure in places and is made more so, rather than less, by the commentators. These suppose the *sidra* tree spoken of, to be located in heaven. It seems to me, on the contrary, to be on

* Koran, 53¹⁻¹⁸.

earth, in fact to be a well-known tree at Mecca, mentioned for the purpose of locating the experience of which the Prophet speaks. He saw this tree covered with something—he purposely does not describe it more exactly—probably a bright light such as was spoken of in tradition and compared to the daybreak. This miracle, upon which his eye was able to look steadfastly, was one of the theophanies in his experience. It is impossible not to see in it a reminiscence of the burning bush in Exodus. At another time, the Prophet tells us, he saw a figure appear in the horizon which descended to the place where he himself was, and talked with him. So in Israel the angel of Yahweh calls out of heaven,* or descends thence, as is evidenced by his ascending in the flame of the sacrifice when his errand is performed.† These analogies would lead us to suppose the nameless being of Mohammed's vision also to be an angel. So he is called by the interpreters, and later by Mohammed himself. But I suspect that in the original meaning of this sura, the one Mighty in power is Allah Himself. If, however, Mohammed did not clearly distinguish between Allah and His Angel, we have another Biblical resemblance. For, as we know, the Old Testament presents the Angel of Yahweh speaking and acting like Yahweh Himself.

In his later revelations Mohammed speaks distinctly of the angel who is sent to him. In one instance only is this angel called Gabriel: "Say to them: Who is the enemy of Gabriel? It is he who brought down [the revelation] to thy heart by the

* Gen. 22^{11, 15}.

† Judg. 13²⁶.

command of God, to confirm what was before revealed, a guidance and good tidings to the believers." * We recall that Gabriel is the messenger of God both in the Old Testament and in the New. That it was New Testament influence, rather than Old, which led Mohammed to adopt him is evident from this very passage. The Jews had the theory that Gabriel was the angel sent with bad tidings to Israel, while the bringer of good tidings was Michael. They therefore refused to accept Mohammed, or rather made this the ostensible ground of their refusal. Had he been under Jewish influence he would have called the angel Michael rather than Gabriel.

We must note again that Mohammed in some cases attributes his revelations to the Spirit: "This is a revelation of the Lord of the Ages with which the faithful spirit came down into thy heart that thou shouldst be one of the warners;" "The spirit of holiness brought it down from thy Lord in truth to strengthen those who believe." † As Mohammed refused to adopt the doctrine of the Trinity, he could have no idea of the Spirit as a distinct person of the Godhead. He seems to have wavered between the conception that the Spirit is one of the angels, and the conception that it is an influence carried by the angels to the prophets. The variations in his doctrine do not concern us here. All that we need to bear in mind is, that he had adopted the Biblical teaching—that the Spirit is the Revealer—so far as this doctrine agreed with his theology in general.

The fact once established in his mind that he was

* Koran, 2⁹¹.

† 26¹⁹² f, 16¹⁰⁴.

commissioned as a Prophet, Mohammed drew certain inferences, which became important parts of his system, and which we cannot ignore in treating his doctrine of revelation. The first of these was that by his call he became one in the line of prophets and religious leaders, of which the world had already seen several. This point has been already touched upon in our discussion of the narrative material in the Koran. As we there saw, the characters most prominently in his mind were the great founders of religion, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. These formed the chain of which now, by his election, he became the concluding link. It went with this that his religion was not new. He only claimed to reproduce what had been revealed to his predecessors. Every religious movement seems naturally to seek itself in the past. Thus the Hebrews saw faith exemplified in Noah and Abraham; Judaism claimed Moses as its founder; the Apostles pointed back to David and Isaiah; the Reformers renewed the Christianity of the Apostles. Mohammed's course is parallel with these. And, like them, he tried to link his religion with earlier ones not only by his renewal of their principles, but by their supposed prophecies of him. This claim—that he was predicted in the earlier Scriptures—is unmistakably, though not very frequently, put forward in the Koran. In a comparatively late sura we find: "Jesus the son of Mary said: O, Children of Israel, verily I am the Apostle of God to you confirming the Tora which you already have, and bringing tidings of an Apostle to come after me whose name is Ahmed."* In another place he is

* Koran, 61⁶.

spoken of as "the vernacular * prophet whom they find described in their own [books], in the Tora and the Gospel." What predictions Mohammed himself had in mind in these declarations seems impossible to make out. The Arabic commentators do not hesitate to refer to him all the Messianic passages of the Old Testament. The Messianic hope, as we know, did not cease with the coming of Christ, and we can scarcely wonder that Mohammed applied it to himself. For the words of Jesus which he claims in the passage quoted, tradition points to the promise of the Paraclete in the Gospel of John. It is significant that this promise had already been appropriated by *Mani*,† for there are some indications that Mohammed got his Christianity from a heretical source. What interests us here is not the particular passage in the Prophet's mind, but the general claim that he was not only the legitimate successor of the earlier Messengers of God, but was also foreseen and expected by them as the "seal" or culmination of their mission.

Another inference from the firmly held belief that he was a prophet, is prominently put forward in the

* The translation is only probable. Mohammed elsewhere emphasizes the fact that he brings an Arabic revelation. The reference here is 7¹⁵⁶. For a discussion of the passages of Scripture applied by Moslems to Mohammed cf. Brockelmann, "Muhammedanische Weissagungen im Alten Testament," Z.A.T.W., XV. pp. 138 ff., 312, with remarks by Bacher, *ibid.*, p. 309; also Goldziher, Z.D.M.G., XLII., and *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX., pp. 1-23. One Mohammedan author finds no less than fifty-one prophecies of Islam in the Bible.

† Cf. Herzog, P.R.E.², IX., p. 231. The passage in John is cited by Ibn Ishak, cf. Weil's *Ibn Hisham*, I., p. 112.

Koran, to wit: that his revelation, as embodied in the Koran, is the same in substance with the sacred books which had preceded. Remember that he made *the Book* an abstraction. He made it at least an intellectual and spiritual entity, not a material thing of paper and ink. His revelations were generally written down, to be sure; they were collected at last from fragments of papyrus and parchment and bones, but also from the breasts of men. The record upon which Mohammed relied however was the memory of his followers. Nevertheless he regarded his detached fragments as parts of a transcendental unity which he called the Book, and whose real existence was in heaven.

Looking more narrowly at what he says of this Book, we discover that he has combined two conceptions originally separate. In connection with the great thought of the judgment, he had adopted the theory of a book of record kept in heaven. In the early suras there are several references to this book, which seems to be either a record of actions or a record of names.* It needed only a little expansion of this to make the book a book of fate containing the whole of God's will for all history. But a book of God was also revealed to the Jews and Christians. They meant by it, to be sure, an earthly codex. Yet the earthly codex might be but the transcript of a heavenly original. According to Jewish tradition,† the Tora was created before the creation of the heavens and the

* Koran, 78²⁷⁻²⁹, 83⁴⁻⁹, 18-20.

† *Midrasch Bereschith Rabba* (Wünsche). p. 31. And cf. Weber, *Altsynagogale Theologie*, p. 14.

earth. Indeed we see that the natural implication of the phrase *Book of God* is that the original is written in heaven. The inference was made by Mohammed: "This is a noble Koran, in a carefully guarded book, touched only by the pure, a revelation from the Lord of the Ages." *

Mohammed's conception therefore may be defined as follows: there is a great book of God's decrees, written in heaven. From this book, portions are sent down to the successive prophets. These are the parts of the Book fitted for the guidance of men into true faith, true worship, and right conduct. The Pentateuch, the Gospel, and the Koran, are all extracts from this original. They are therefore identical in substance, and one corroborates the other. One of the earliest of Mohammed's revelations alludes to the rolls of Abraham and Moses, as containing a warning similar to the one just delivered by himself. It is unnecessary to suppose, with Sprenger, that there is a reference here to pseudepigrapha which circulated under these titles. The Pentateuch might well be described under the name of the roll of Abraham or the roll of Moses. In later passages we find it distinctly said that the Koran confirms the preceding revelations: "Before this was the Book of Moses, a guide and a gift of grace, and this [Koran] is a book which asserts the truth [of the other] in Arabic, that it may warn the evil-doers." † The attitude of the Prophet is well brought out in what he is commanded to say to the Jews of Medina who per-

* Koran, 56⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹. cf. 85¹ f., 80¹³ f.

† 46¹¹, cf. 2⁸³, 6⁹², 12¹¹¹, 35³⁸ f.

sisted in asking him troublesome questions about the Tora: "Say to them: We believe in God and what is revealed to us, and in what was revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the [twelve] tribes, and in what Moses and Jesus and the Prophets received from their Lord. We make no difference between them and we are resigned to Him." * Although Koran was the proper name of the portion revealed to him, he seems in one instance to call the whole body of revealed books by this name. This is where he denounces *the dividers who make the Koran parts*. The most natural explanation of the words is that they refer to the Jews and Christians who, by rejecting the later while accepting the earlier revelation, put asunder what Mohammed joined together.

The theory of Mohammed is a perfectly consistent one, and when he had formulated it, he did not waver. The Jews, we may well believe, made strenuous efforts to convict him of error, in that he represented their Tora to be identical with his revelations. The only effect on his mind was to strengthen the conviction of their obstinacy and deceit. We wonder a little that he did not take more pains to acquaint himself with the exact contents of Tora and Gospel. Yet not a few theologians, before his time and since, have been willing to rest in their *a priori* system, and have ignored or denied those facts which conflicted with it. The attitude of Mohammed is seen in the anecdote that Omar brought a Pentateuch to Mohammed and offered to read out of it. The anger of the Prophet appeared in his face and Omar desisted,

* Koran, 37^a.

saying: "God protect me from the anger of God and His Apostle! It suffices me that God is my Cherisher, and Islam my religion, and Mohammed my prophet." Then Mohammed said: "If Moses were alive and knew my prophecy he would follow me." * The position of Mohammed is quite intelligible. The principles of Islam were established; for the faith of its disciples the confirmation of these principles from the Bible was unnecessary. On the other hand the facts *might be* inconvenient. On either view, it was best to let well enough alone.

It was not the facts of the older Scriptures alone that were troublesome. The Koran itself did not always seem to bear out the character given it. It could not be expected that a collection of occasional leaflets, published at intervals during more than twenty years, should be free from inconsistencies or even contradictions. Such inconsistencies were admitted by Mohammed himself. Some of them he removed by erasure. In some cases he laid the blame on his own memory, and once he confessed that Satan had misled him. Finally he declared that God abrogated some regulations by later enactments.† It is possible that the theory of abrogation was at first invented to account for discrepancies between the Bible and the Koran. Two of the passages which state the theory are in a context which has to do with the Jews; and the thought in Mohammed's mind seems to have been something like this: "Should the Jews object that

* *Mishcat*, I., p. 53.

† The theory, with a list of the abrogated verses, is given in Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 520.

this revelation does not agree with theirs, we reply that God is able to erase parts of His revelation—He may do what He will with His own.” The theory once accepted was a welcome recourse, when discrepancies came to light in the Koran itself.*

It seems strange to us that Mohammed made no forecast of the future. One would suppose that the experience which led him to abrogate regulations only a few years old, would show him that other laws would need to be modified after his death. But this seems not to have occurred to him. The necessities of the hour absorbed his thoughts. In the main, no doubt, he felt that the principles laid down by him would be a sufficient guide for all time to come. It must be remembered also that he gave tradition a part in the regulation of his community. In this respect he never took the Protestant position which makes the Scriptures the exclusive arbiter in matters of faith and life. He would have accepted, rather, the rule of the early Church in which Apostolic tradition had so large a part.

Koran and tradition together make up the infallible rule of faith and practice in the Moslem Church. Of the two parts, the Koran must always have the first place—a clear sentence in the Koran, unless it is one

* The Koran passages are 2¹⁰⁰, 13³³ f, both of which are in connection with allusions to the earlier revelations. A tradition gives a Koran verse which was not only abrogated but obliterated—*Bochari*, III., p. 190. The fact that the Tora did not contain some things which ought to be in it on his theory, Mohammed explains by saying that the Jews concealed them from the Moslems; “Our Apostle has come to you revealing a great part of what you are accustomed to conceal of the Book.” 5¹⁸.

that has been abrogated by another sentence in the Koran, is decisive. This position of arbiter is parallel to what is asserted of the older revelation: "We sent down the Tora as a guide and a light; by it *the pious prophets judged* the Jews; and the Rabbis and the Scribes [still] judge by what is committed to them of the Book of God, and are witnesses concerning it." Mohammed goes on to give a summary of the Old Testament *lex talionis* and adds: "And whoever does not judge by what God has revealed, these are the wicked."* A little later in the same chapter Jesus is said to have received the Gospel—"that the people of the Gospel should judge by what God revealed." Then comes Mohammed, who also has received a book and who is exhorted thus: "Then judge between them by what God has revealed, and do not follow their desires, turning away from what has come to thee of the truth. To each of you we have given a law and a plain path."†

This declaration puts the Koran into the same position of supreme law for the Moslem which the Tora occupies for the Jew, and which the Gospel occupies for the Christian. The conception of the revelation as law becomes especially prominent in the later period of Mohammed's life. We can readily account for this. At Medina the simple warner and bringer of tidings had become the theocratic ruler and judge over a small but heterogeneous community, unused to a settled form of government. His decisions, therefore, became precedents and his regulations became laws. These were embodied in the Koran, which,

* Koran, 5¹⁸ f.

† 5³².

in this period differs materially in character from the earlier revelations. The later suras are in a sense the archives of the infant state. "The conduct of the disaffected, the treatment of allies, the formation of treaties, the acceptance of terms and other political matters [now] found a place among the divine messages. Liberality in contributing toward the expenses of war—the only object requiring a public purse—is continually inculcated. The elements of a code both criminal and civil are also introduced. Punishments for certain offences are specified, and a mass of legislation [is] laid down for the tutelage of orphans, for marriage, divorce, sales, bargains, wills, evidence, usury, and other similar concerns. Further, there are copious instructions for the guidance of the believer in his private life and special provisions . . . regulating the intercourse of Mahomet with his subjects and with his own family."* This occasional character of the Koran is most conspicuous in its allusions to the experiences of Mohammed himself. Many of these are interesting for the glimpse they give us into the heart of the speaker; as where he betrays his great anxiety to work a miracle. Some of them are comical; as where he teaches etiquette to the too familiar or too noisy Bedawin: "O, Believers, do not lift your voices above the voice of the Prophet, and do not shout at him as you shout at each other; else your deeds are of no avail, though you know it not. They who speak low in the presence of the Apostle of God, these are they whose hearts God has disposed toward piety."† And again: "O,

* Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, III., 295.

† Koran, 49² f.

Believers, do not enter the houses of the Prophet except he invite you to eat with him; and do so without looking at his furniture. But when you are invited, then enter; and when you have eaten, then go your ways, and do not be familiar in your conversation. This pains the Prophet, though he is ashamed to tell you; but God is not ashamed of the truth. And when you ask anything of them [that is, his wives], ask it from the other side of a curtain—this is more innocent for your hearts and for theirs. It is not becoming in you to pain the Prophet, nor to marry his wives after his death. This were in the sight of God a great sin.”* To bring in a divine revelation in order to ease the jealous heart of a fond old man, seems to us to border on blasphemy. And when the same method is taken to justify him in violating the rule which he had himself made on the subject of marriage,† and again to vindicate his favorite wife when she was the subject of scandal, we are shocked and disgusted.

* Koran, 33⁵³. The houses of the Prophet were a row of huts around a court. Each wife had one, and Mohammed dwelt with them by turns.

† Mohammed had ordered his followers to take not more than four wives. He increased his own hareem to nine or more and justified himself by a revelation (33⁴⁹). He was seized with a passion for the wife of his adopted son Zaid. Zaid divorced her, but it was against customary morals for a man to marry the divorced wife of an adopted son. After some wavering, Mohammed commanded himself (in a revelation) to take her; and of course he thus set aside the old law (33³⁷). In forbidding remarriage on the part of the widows he might leave, he possibly had Jewish precedent in mind, according to Sale, *Prelim. Dis.*, who cites Mishna *Sanhedrin*, to prove that the widow of a prince should not remarry.

In view of such exhibitions of selfish weakness, our impulse is to set down their author as a vulgar impostor, whose aim from the beginning was to secure enjoyment and influence by a forged and fraudulent revelation. In doing this we should easily do him an injustice. Even these exhibitions of weakness may be explained as the defect of a quality. Mohammed had placed his trust in Allah, and he was convinced that Allah had distinguished him by his favor. It is of the essence of faith to believe that God loves us and cares for us individually. One of the most pleasing suras of the Koran is the expression of this faith:

“ By the morning ;
By the night when it grows dark ;
Thy Lord has not forsaken nor rejected thee ;
And the future shall be better than the past.
Thy Lord will give thee and thou shalt be satisfied.
Did He not find thee an orphan and adopt thee ?
And find thee poor and enrich thee ?
Then do not oppress the orphan ;
And do not repulse the one who asks ;
And recount the mercies of thy Lord.” *

In a mind whose early moral training has been defective we can see that such a faith may lead to self-deception. It is to be feared that not a few Christians have taken virtually the position of Mohammed—that God so loves them as to indulge their weaknesses even as an earthly father indulges a favorite child.

To pursue this subject would take us beyond the

* Sura 93, and cf. 94.

proper limits of this inquiry. We are here investigating the nature of the influence exerted by the Bible on the religion of Mohammed. For the subject of this lecture we may describe this influence as follows :

1. Mohammed's general doctrine of revelation was undoubtedly derived from the Bible. The doctrine is that God reveals His will to chosen men who are commanded to speak for Him, and who are called prophets or apostles.

2. The revelation which the prophet receives is brought by an angel. This method of revelation, which is only occasional in the Bible, is made the rule by Mohammed, for he identifies revelation *by the Spirit* with this, because he makes the Spirit to be an angel. In some cases he so completely adopts the Biblical view that he gives the angel of revelation the name Gabriel.

3. He speaks always (when delivering the message revealed to him) for God, using the pronoun of the first person, not to express his own mind, but to express the mind of God. In this also he follows Biblical precedent, where, in the height of prophetic speech, the ego of the prophet disappears before the Higher Ego.* Here also, what is occasional in the Old Testament has become the rule with Mohammed. That the cause of God is identified with the cause of the prophet, is the natural consequence of this view.

And in this connection we must not shut our eyes to the fact that God's care for His cause is, in the Old Testament, extended to the personal affairs of the

* Ewald, *Propheten des Alten Bundes*?, p. 33.

prophet. Jeremiah was informed by revelation of the intended treachery of his fellow-townsmen. Samuel was directed by revelation in making use of a subterfuge to deceive Saul, and thus to relieve his own fear. God identifies Elisha's honor with His own, and where the prophet relieves his feelings with a curse, God makes the curse effective in avenging the insult. Such examples show that Mohammed's presumption is not altogether without precedent.

4. The revelation received by the prophet is regarded by Mohammed as a transcript from a heavenly original. In this he has gone farther than any express declaration of the Bible, but it is not unfair to say that the general thought is Biblical. Besides what has already been said, we may notice that when Ezekiel received his revelation, a roll was given him by a heavenly hand. When he had eaten the book (devoured its contents we should say) he was prepared to speak to Israel.* The meaning is that his prophecy was the communication of a heavenly original. The author of the Apocalypse has a similar experience in vision. On the basis of these passages the idea of a heavenly original, of which revealed books are transcripts, had arisen before Mohammed. Thus Enoch has the heavenly tablets shown him in which he reads "all the deeds of men to the latest generations."† He is then able to embody these in his own

* Ezek. 2¹⁰, 3¹⁻⁴.

† *Das Buch Henoch*, von Dillmann (1853), Kap. 81, p. 51. In the Book of Jubilees the Bible itself seems to be described as the heavenly tablets. Cf. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Ewald, *Jahrbücher*, II., pp. 237, 256.

book. But as Mohammed's idea of prophecy is more distinctly Biblical than that found in the Book of Enoch, there is probably no direct influence here to be discovered.

5. The sum of the revelations received by the prophet makes up a rule of faith and life. This idea is also Biblical ; at least, this is the point of view from which the New Testament regards the Old Testament, though it at the same time formulates a theory of abrogation similar to the one forced upon Mohammed.

Mohammed, therefore, held substantially Biblical views of Revelation and Prophecy.

LECTURE VII.

SIN AND SALVATION

SOME years ago it was the fashion to describe the Protestant Reformation as based upon two principles. One of these—the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith—was called the formal principle, the other—justification by faith—was called the material principle. The present tendency is to dismiss this definition as having no particular value. But I have the impression that it conveys a distinct truth which is of wider application than is given it in this one division of Church History. Every religion—at least every positive religion—brings a doctrine to which it demands assent. The first question which its preachers must answer is: how do you know the doctrine to be true? But no religion succeeds without bringing more than a doctrine. Religion must satisfy the craving of the heart, as well as the curiosity of the intellect. The second question which the Apostles of any religion must meet is: what good do you bring?

Now the answer to the first question must define the source of doctrine. In the Protestant Reformation this source was defined to be the Holy Scriptures in their natural sense, independent of the tradition of the Church. The answer to the second question

must define the salvation offered by the preacher. In the Reformation this was defined as justification by faith alone, that is, the grace of God imparted immediately to the believer, not conditioned by the Church's ministration. Without pausing to inquire how far these two answers are correctly labelled, *formal* and *material*, let us notice that corresponding answers are given in Islam. Mohammed preached a doctrine, and was obliged to tell where he got it. This he did in his assertion of divine revelation to himself, at the same time justifying his claim by an appeal to the earlier prophets. He offered also another boon—salvation. He was obliged here also to define his position. This definition forms the subject of the present lecture.

I have already said that Mohammed offered salvation. Salvation implies something from which one must be saved, and this something is, of course, sin. The doctrine of sin must be treated before we can understand the doctrine of salvation. Our starting-point is the nature of man. In this the position of the Koran is very simple: man consists of a material part, the body, and an immaterial part, the soul. This was taken over from Arabic heathenism, where the custom of offering sacrifices to the dead implies a continued existence of the soul after the death of the body. This separate existence of the soul however seems to have been conceived of as shadowy and unreal—much like the unsubstantial and unsatisfying state in which the Old Testament pictures the inhabitants of Sheol. It was because this conception failed to meet his idea of the future state, that Mo-

hammed laid so much emphasis on the resurrection. His leading thought was the thought of the Judgment Day. But a judgment which should deal only with the unsubstantial incorporeal shades would be itself unsubstantial and shadowy. The thought of the Judgment is necessarily accompanied by the thought of the Resurrection—thus only does it become a reality. With the restored body, the whole man meets his Maker, and both parts of his nature are punished or rewarded for that for which both parts are responsible.

This matter interests us here only so far as it throws light on the nature of man. At the beginning of his career, Mohammed found the doctrine of the resurrection necessary, because he had difficulty in conceiving the independent existence of the soul. It seems as if the doctrine helped him in this respect so that he was able partly to dispense with it in his later teaching. What I mean is, not that he ever gave up the resurrection or wavered in regard to it; but that when he had accustomed himself to the doctrine of the resurrection, the soul itself had more consistency, it began to stand more distinctly for the man. He never seems to have been troubled by the question where the soul resides during the interval between death and the resurrection. Tradition has indeed busied itself with this question, as we should expect. But the Koran has no intimation of a middle state, such as we should find had it been a matter of importance in the mind of Mohammed.

After the battles of Islam began, we find a distinct assurance that the souls of believers enter at once on

the joys of paradise. This implies, of course, that the soul is capable of its full life apart from the body. The resurrection therefore would seem to be superfluous. The soul is the man and can dispense with the body, as it does in death and even in sleep.* Because the soul is the man it may be spoken of when the whole man is meant.

The souls which tremble in the day of judgment are the souls reclothed with their bodies, that is, the persons. When it is said that every soul shall taste of death, evidently every human being is meant. The soul being the active principle, is that which desires good or evil,† just as in Hebrew; the word for soul is, in fact, the same in the two languages.

A close parallel with the Hebrew also is the Arabic connection of the soul and the heart. The heart is the seat of the soul—not the affections only, but the intellect as well. What may be predicated of the soul may be predicated equally of the heart. Thus: the soul believes, *or* the man believes with the heart.‡ The heart is terrified; it is the seat of the intelligence. God seals or covers the hearts so that men do not understand; the hearts of believers find peace in remembering God.§ You will already have noticed the great similarity between these affirmations

* In 6⁵⁰ God is said to take the souls in the night (that is, in sleep) with the same language with which the angels are said to take the souls at death, 6⁶¹, cf. also 39⁴³. Those who have been slain in battle for the good cause cannot be called dead—they are the truly living, though beyond our sight, 2¹⁴⁹.

† Koran 53²³, 41³¹.

‡ 10¹⁰⁰, 16¹⁰³.

§ 50³⁶, 15¹², 6²⁵, 13²⁸.

and the language of the Old Testament. It is not probable, however, that there was direct dependence. The simple psychology was common to Hebrew and to Arabic thought before the rise of Islam.

The result which we have reached is important for our present inquiry in two ways. First, there is no trichotomy in man according to the Koran ; secondly, the seat of sin is not the body alone.

There is no clear indication of a trichotomy in man. It is indeed said that man's life or soul is derived from the spirit of God. God Himself says to the angels: "I am about to make man of clay, and when I have formed him and breathed into him of my spirit, then bow down to him."* In adopting this Biblical language, Mohammed was probably ignorant of the Christian speculation, which would see in it authority for a third element of the human personality, different from body and soul. He speaks of the creation of animals in language similar to what was just quoted, where he says that Jesus made birds of clay and breathed into them so that they became alive.† Mohammed seems to conceive of the breathing as the method of introducing life into the creature. He nowhere speaks of the *spirit* of man. In this respect the Mohammedan theologians have gone beyond their master, and have learned from the Christians to distinguish between the spirit and the soul of man.‡ But this is foreign to the Koran, which knows but one immaterial part of man—the soul, which has its seat in the heart.

* Koran 32⁸, cf. 15²⁹, 38⁷².

† 5¹¹⁰.

‡ My wisdom comes from Lane, *Arabic Lexicon*, p. 2827.

The doctrine that the soul is the man, precludes the idea that sin is the evil of the body—or that the flesh is the seat of sin. This is not contradicted by the prominence given to the desires as a source of sin, for the desires pertain to the soul. Oriental speculation on this subject seems not to have reached Mohammed. If it reached him, it made no impression upon him. In fact, as we have had occasion to remark, he was no philosopher or speculative theologian. The problem which confronted him was a practical problem. Before him, scattered individuals throughout the tribes—the *Hanifs* already alluded to—had labored with it as a practical problem. They sought a peace of conscience which the rites of heathenism could not give. Mohammed's interest was no other. In him as in them, the sense of sin was aroused experimentally. Hence came the long practice of prayer and ascetic exercises in the cave of Hira. When he found assurance, he found it in the sense of pardon. The fact of sin and ill desert was not thereby abolished; it was rather established. The thought of the Day of Judgment took strong hold upon him, *just because* he so strongly realized the fact of sin in himself. What he experienced in himself he observed in others. The call to preach, of which he was so vividly conscious, was based upon the conviction that his contemporaries were in sin and under the wrath of God.

On the basis of his personal experience Mohammed believed in the universality of sin. He transferred his own experience to other men and classed them with himself. This we conclude from indirect in-

timations rather than from express affirmations of the Koran. He nowhere asserts categorically the sinfulness of the whole race. He had to do with a condition, not a theory. In a tradition he is reported as saying: "There is not of the sons of Adam except Mary and her Son, one born but is touched by the devil at the time of his birth; and the child makes a loud noise from the touch."* The tradition is doubtless influenced by some theory of natural depravity. But it does not affirm the transmission of sin from father to son—the idea is rather that from the moment of birth every human being is assailed by Satan. The universality of actual transgression does not necessarily follow.

It is in fact rather remarkable that Mohammed should so fully adopt the Biblical account of the sin of Adam, and yet not connect with it the doctrine of the corruption of the race. Let me hasten to say that he does not show any closer adherence to the letter of the Bible in this than in the other Biblical narratives, in fact the departures are rather more noticeable in this than in the others. His account is to the effect that Adam and his wife were created of clay and placed in the Garden of Paradise, which is in heaven. God commands the angels to bow down to Adam as His vicegerent. All obey except Iblis, who refuses on the ground that Adam is his inferior. Iblis is then expelled from the Garden because of his arrogance, but receives permission to act as the tempter of man. Adam and his wife are commanded not to eat of one tree in the Garden, and are warned

* *Mishcat*, I, p. 23.

against the wiles of Satan. Nevertheless Satan insinuates that the tree is forbidden to them because, if they eat, they will become angels or immortal. So they eat, and both tempter and tempted are cast down to earth to live in mutual enmity until the day of final doom. The story, which is given several times in the Koran, may be said to embody Mohammed's theory of the origin of sin. This was to him a very simple matter—sin is disobedience to the commands of God. It came into being when the pride of Iblis revolted against a command of God. It was transmitted from Iblis to Adam by way of suggestion, and in him its essence was disobedience to the command of God. That Adam was originally endowed with holiness and lost it in his fall, is nowhere affirmed. No more is such a solidarity of the race affirmed or assumed as would make all mankind sin in Adam and fall with him in his first transgression.

Although we find no theory of an organic connection between the sin of Adam and the sinfulness of the race, yet the story of the first man is not unmeaning. It is an example of the universal experience. All men are subject to temptation. This comes from their desires. We read of the wicked: "In their hearts is a disease, and God increases their disease";* and again: "Evil is that which their souls have put before them."† In this passage the soul seems put for the desires, as we find it also in the old Testament. In the account given of Joseph the hero himself confesses that "the soul inclines to evil except my Lord have mercy."‡ Elsewhere Mohammed is warned against him who

* Koran 2⁹.† 5⁸³.‡ 12⁵³.

follows his inclination ; and virtue is said to consist in restraining the soul from its inclination.* These passages show that Mohammed was not far from the New Testament treatment of concupiscence as the root of sin. When desire conceives, it brings forth sin.

These desires are stimulated by the allurements of the world and the suggestions of Satan. In the great Day, men and jinn will be asked: "Did there not come to you Apostles from your own number, repeating to you My revelations and warning you of this day? They will say: We testify against ourselves—the life of the world beguiled us."† The result of the natural constitution of things is that men go astray. In this view of it, it is entirely correct to speak of the lost estate of man. But this is not due to the sin of Adam.

We have already noticed instances in which *tradition* shows a nearer approach to Christian theology than we find in the Koran. This is illustrated in the subject before us. Mohammed is said to have related a legend concerning Adam and to have added: "So Adam denied and his children have inherited this vice: and Adam forgot and ate of the tree, and his children have inherited forgetfulness from him; and Adam committed a fault and his children inherited crimes from him."‡ This goes beyond anything in the Koran in its assertion of inherited depravity, and we are compelled to suppose that it is colored by the views of the traditionist. We find also a story in the biographies which has obtained currency in most modern accounts of Mohammed to this

* Koran 18²⁷, 79⁴⁰.

† 6¹⁵⁰.

‡ *Mishcat*, I., p. 35.

effect: When the Prophet was an infant (in another form of the story when he was twelve years old), two angels cut open his breast and took out his heart which they washed with snow and then restored to his bosom. The story in this form is undoubtedly meant to teach that the infant's heart was thus cleansed of hereditary depravity. But we are able to say that the story in this form is comparatively late. As first told, it was connected not with the Prophet's infancy but with the beginning of his ministry. In this form it meant only that when God called Mohammed, He cleansed him from the guilt of his former sins—especially from the idolatry which he had practised in his earlier life. In this form we cannot find any reference to the doctrine of original sin.

The origin of sin is in the conflict between the natural desires of men and the command of God. "The truth [has come] from your Lord; whoever will, let him believe, and whoever will, let him disbelieve." * Whether the light of nature is enough to induce obedience we are not told. In practice the command of God comes through the prophets. The sin which is in the world is disobedience to these commands. Those who disobey, following the allurements of the world or of Satan, are lost. To realize how much this word meant to Mohammed we must picture to ourselves the condition of the traveller in the desert. The pathless waste stretches out on every hand. The wells are few and hidden in the sand. The pitiless sun burns upon him from above and the heated soil scorches his feet from below. The scanty water-skins

* Koran 18²⁹.

are soon exhausted. Unless some friendly hand point the way to water, the caravan must lie down and die. Such is the condition of man in the present world. He is a wanderer in a desert—in hopeless perplexity unless he has a guide. In this sense all men are lost unless God intervenes for their rescue.

That this was Mohammed's view we cannot doubt. He had in his own heart an abiding sense of his need of guidance. The only real petition in his model prayer (the *Fatiha*) asks for guidance; and he interprets the petition for us in the words: "Our Lord, do not let our hearts wander, after Thou hast directed us; give us grace from Thee—Thou art the bountiful Giver." * And a further commentary is afforded by the traditions. Mohammed was asked what he was accustomed to say in his private devotions. He replied: "I say: O God put my sins as far away from me as Thou hast put the East from the West; O God, cleanse me from sin as the white garment is cleansed from its filth; O God, wash away my sins with water and with snow and with hail." † I need hardly call your attention to the Scripture affirmation that God "has put our sins as far from us as the East is from the West," and to the language of Job concerning washing himself in snow water. The resemblance may be owing partly to the traditionist, but there is no reason to suppose that the sentiment is not genuinely Mohammed's.

The sense of sin thus revealed is found also in Mohammed's companions. Abu Bekr asked Mohammed to teach him a prayer to be used in his private devo-

* Koran 3⁶.

† *Bochari*, I., p. 167.

tions. The form given was: "O, God, I have wronged my own soul with grievous sin, and none forgives sins but Thou; forgive me with Thy forgiveness, and have compassion unto me—verily Thou art the Forgiving, the Compassionate." * Abu Bekr was of an emotional nature, and we are not surprised to find such desires in him. But Omar, the man of iron will and cool head, was affected with the same concern: "I heard the sobbing of Omar (says one of the Companions), when I was in the last row [in the mosque] as he recited: I show my grief and my sorrow to God alone." † Others of the early Moslems wept when prosperity came to them, fearing that they were receiving their recompense in this life. One of the Companions came to consult him, and the Prophet said: Are you come to ask what is goodness and what is badness? On receiving an affirmative reply (says the narrator), he joined his fingers together and struck them upon my breast, that is, he made a sign toward my heart, and said: Ask the sentence from thine own heart. This he repeated three times and added: "Goodness is a thing from which the heart finds firmness and rest, and badness is a thing which throws thee into doubt, though men may approve." ‡ The sentence reminds us of Paul's treatment of conscience, but it is not quoted for that analogy. It is in place here, because it throws light upon the mind of Mohammed and his

* *Bochari*, I., p. 187.

† *Ibid.*, p. 162. Omar, was, of course, in the front row of those praying.

‡ *Mishcat*, II., p. 4. For some striking examples of the dread of sin, see Kremer, *Herrschende Ideen des Islam*, p. 24.

followers. We can scarcely interpret it otherwise than as indicating a sincere dread of sin and a sincere desire for righteousness.

We must conclude that the power of Mohammed's message consisted in its appeal to the conscience. It threatened punishment which was felt to be deserved. It was therefore a message of salvation. And the vividness of the sense of ill desert was such as to paint a picture of impending doom, from which men would be glad to flee. This doom was conceived of either as a Day of the Lord—that is, a great catastrophe such as had overtaken Sodom and destroyed Pharaoh—or as the Day of final Judgment. As to the great catastrophe, it is possible, even probable, that Mohammed's early preaching set a time for its coming more definitely than now appears. The present text of the Koran is rather guarded in its language: "*Perhaps* a portion of that which you desire to hasten is close upon you;" "Men ask thee concerning the Hour. Say: The knowledge of it is with God alone, and how dost thou know whether it may not be near?"* In a few instances we find apparently categorical statements that the Hour is near, and that its signs are already discernible. It is probable that these were once more numerous. But the urgency of his opponents that Mohammed should fix a definite time for the punishment, taught him caution.

If there was some uncertainty as to God's intervention in an overthrow of the Meccan state, there could be none as to the final Judgment. That was certain, and its decision would be irreversible. In

* Koran 27⁴, 33³³.

that day repentance will no longer avail, and those who are confronted with the list of their sins will wish in vain for one hour of earthly life in which to accept the message of their prophet. They will be asked whether they had not had the opportunity to repent; whether apostles had not come to warn them of their danger. They will be obliged to confess that they have brought their punishment on themselves. Salvation (this is the conclusion) is offered to men by the apostles of God. It was offered to Adam after his fall: "Adam received from his Lord words, and repented (He is the Indulgent, the Compassionate)—We said: Go down hence, and when there comes to you guidance from Me, whoever follows My guidance, no fear shall rest upon such nor shall they be grieved." * Adam thus received the words of grace directly from God, and with them a promise of future revelation to the race.

In what has been said thus far, you will discover the substantial agreement of Mohammed with Biblical doctrine. Aside from Paul, whose philosophical discussion has perhaps unduly colored later theology, the Biblical writers lay no emphasis upon the fall of man in Adam. At the same time they assume the prevalence of sin, and its practical universality. Their conviction is based upon the testimony of their own consciences. They feel, therefore, the need of salvation. This feeling is quickened by the preaching of the Prophets who proclaim a Day of Yahweh, a day of calamity upon the evil-doers. In the New Testament this Day of the Lord is com-

* Koran 2³⁵ f.

bined with the final Judgment. The time is evidently thought to be near, though it is expressly declared that no man knows the day nor the hour. The emphasis of the message is laid upon the way of escape provided by God Himself. This way of escape was apparently open to Adam and was indicated by a promise made to him for his descendants. In all these respects, Mohammed took strictly Biblical ground.

Looking more narrowly at the idea of salvation as set forth in Islam, we discover, first, that it is of God's free grace. He has provided in His ordinary administration of the world (that is, in nature) all that man could require at His hands. But this has proved insufficient. Man is ungrateful and inaccessible to such evidences. God therefore adds something more, in giving His revelation. Not that Mohammed draws a definite line marking off God's goodness in nature from His goodness in the scheme of salvation. He speaks of the *grace* of God in both. This word * means the state of mind which leads one to help or pardon the undeserving; grace, mercy, or compassion are our equivalents. This state of mind in God is shown by His ordinary providence. The rain is an expression of His grace, and the winds which bring the clouds are its precursors. The succession of day and night is adapted to the needs of man, and this is of His grace. When trouble comes upon men they pray to God, and He makes them taste His grace in that He sends them relief.†

* *Rahma*; the root is found also in Hebrew.

† Koran 25⁵⁰, 28⁷³, 30³².

Salvation is another evidence and outworking of the same grace. The prophets of earlier times were saved from the destruction which overtook the unbelievers by a *grace* (or *mercy*) from God.* By the same *grace* those who are admitted to Paradise are saved, and they recognize the fact.† The special proof of this mind on the part of God is the gift of revelation. The prophet Salih remonstrates with his people: "O, my people! Do you not see? If I have received a plain sign from my Lord, and if there has come to me from Him a grace [that is, a *revelation*], who will defend me from Him if I rebel against him?"‡ In a nearly related sense the prophet is himself said to be a grace from God. So the angel of the annunciation, speaking for God, says to Mary: "We have made him [Jesus] a sign to mankind, and a *grace* from Us.§ Mohammed also is addressed in the words: "We have sent thee as a grace to the universe." The same word is applied to the revelation when embodied in a book: "When Moses' anger was appeased he took up the Tables in whose characters was a direction and a grace to those who fear their Lord."|| The "grace of God which bringeth salvation" is a Biblical phrase which well sums up the view of Mohammed as set forth in these passages.

But the grace of God does not limit itself to providing the revelation which guides men into life. It is also exerted efficaciously upon the hearts of men, moving them to obey the revelation. I know not how

* Koran 7⁷⁰, 11⁰¹.

§ 19²¹.

† 3¹⁰³, 7⁴⁷.

|| 12¹⁰⁷, 7¹⁶³.

‡ 11⁶⁶.

otherwise to interpret those passages which pray for direction, like the one already quoted—"Lord, let not our hearts stray from the right path after Thou hast once directed us." The revelation was already there. What the speaker desired further was grace in the Christian sense, that is: a positive movement of God upon his heart. Again: "Were not the bounty of God and His grace upon you, not one of you would ever be pure; but God purifies whom He will, and God is the one who hears and knows." * The Prophet is here exhorting his own followers and warning them against following the footsteps of Satan. He evidently means that something more than the revelation is the efficient cause of their purification. In one passage he classes himself with those just addressed: "Had not the bounty and the *grace* of thy Lord been upon thee, a party of them had purposed to lead thee astray [and succeeded]. But they shall lead astray only themselves, and shall not harm thee in any respect. God hath sent down upon thee the Book and the grace, and hath taught thee what thou didst not know, and the bounty of God toward thee was great." † It is evident on the face of the passage that some trap was prepared for Mohammed from which he escaped. He ascribed his escape to a special exercise of grace on the part of God.

This is the place to inquire for the doctrine of *particular election*. We must, however, be careful not to put more into words than the author intended. The general assertion that God chooses His instruments does not imply an absolute decree extending

* Koran 24²¹.

† 4¹¹³.

to the lot of all mankind. The question of such a decree seems to have been brought home to Mohammed by the Jews. They insisted that they were an elect people, and the implication was obvious that God had rejected the other nations. Against this implication Mohammed asserted God's sovereign freedom. The election of Israel he acknowledged: "God chose for Himself Adam and Noah and the family of Abraham and the family of Imran [the father of Mary] above all the world." * But he refused to acknowledge the validity of the inference drawn by the Jews. "If God had pleased, He had made them [that is, *mankind*] a single nation. But He lets whom He will partake of His grace, and the evil-doers have neither protector nor helper." † That is to say: true religion is not a matter of race; all mankind might have been the favored recipients of revelation; the preference of one part over another rests in the will of God; He may and does admit others to His grace as well as the Jews. The verse, therefore, vindicates the freedom of God against a too narrow doctrine of election. ‡ It reminds us that Paul reasons in a similar way. The Jew claims that God has bound Himself to save

* Koran 3³⁰.

† 42⁶.

‡ Against the maxim of the Jews to trust none but those of their own religion, Mohammed says: "Say: Verily the Guidance is God's Guidance, that any man may receive the like of what you have received, or may even surpass you in the sight of your Lord. Say: Verily the bounty is in the hand of God; He bestows it upon whom He will, and God is liberal, wise. He distinguishes by His grace whom He will, and He is the possessor of enormous bounty" (3^{66 f}). It must be clear that the opposition is between the narrowness of Judaism, which recognizes no religion but its own, and the breadth of a divine choice which is not confined within lines of race.

those who are born under the Law ; Paul replies that He has mercy on whom He will have mercy. This is not an assertion of the absoluteness of the decree. It is a protest against the narrowness of those who limit the grace of God by the absoluteness of an election once made.

Still, the protest assumes the actuality of the decree. The election is there, although no longer confined by lines of descent. God not only chooses the prophets as His distinguished instruments ; He chooses also the other believers : “Of their [that is, *the Prophets*] fathers, and of their children, and of their brothers, have We chosen, and have led them on the straight path. This is the guidance of God by whom He guides whom He will of His servants ; but if they become polytheists, what they have done will be of no account. These are they to whom We have given the Book and wisdom and prophecy ; and if they disbelieve in it, We will appoint for it a people who do not disbelieve.”* The divine choice is here asserted, but it is not an absolute choice. Even those who are chosen may become polytheists, thus falling away. In one passage, however, we find that the will of the believer is dependent upon the divine will : “This, now, is a reminder ; whoever *will* let him choose the way to his Lord. But *you will not will* unless God will.”† Some other passages bearing on this subject have already been quoted in the lecture on the Government of God. What we there discovered is confirmed here—that Mohammed had no rigid theory on the subject.

* Koran C³⁷ ff.

† 76¹⁹ f.

The general theory of predestination (as we saw) is an affirmation that the disbelief of man cannot really thwart the will of God. On the side of faith, this conviction is aided by the soul's consciousness of its own weakness. The awakened man finds within himself no ability to meet the commands of God. His judgment concerning his own will is, that it is averse to good and dead in sin. When he finds himself believing in God and appropriating His grace, he feels that this is not his own unaided act. The doctrine of grace is a judgment founded on this experience. Saving faith must be explained as the effect of grace. Mohammed's view is seen in the following, addressed to believers: "God has made you love faith, and has made it attractive in your hearts, and has made infidelity and vice and rebellion odious to you."* With this compare the following: "We sent Jesus, the son of Mary and gave Him the Gospel, *and placed in the hearts* of those who followed him *compassion and grace*;" and again: "It is He who sent the Shekina into the hearts of the believers to increase them in faith after they had once believed."† The doctrine of election, as far as it is held, is a part of the doctrine of grace.

The same thing is true of the Scripture doctrine, where it is apparently asserted that faith is a gift from God, and where the believer is encouraged to work out his own salvation *because* it is God who is working in him to will and to do of His good pleasure. The revelation alone does not save men. This is evident from its different effects upon different men. To some

* Koran 49⁷ and cf. 58²².

† 57²⁷, 48¹.

it is a savor from death unto death, to others a savor from life unto life. No other, as I understand it, is the position of Mohammed. In one place he says directly that what has been revealed to him increases the disobedience and unbelief of some who hear.* In all these respects therefore the doctrine of Islam shows Biblical influence.

The next thing to be noted is that the mark of salvation is *faith*. Up to this point we have discussed the divine provision. This consists not only in a revelation of God's will, but also in efficient grace for those who are to be saved. The evidence that the grace has taken effect is that its subjects *believe*. Those who believe are saved and those who disbelieve are lost. These two classes appear on almost every page of the Koran. The fundamental importance of faith, however, is not so clearly marked in the earlier suras as in the later. At first Mohammed seems to have been under the influence of the Gospel description of the judgment—where the saved and the lost are distinguished rather by their works than by their faith. They who have fed the hungry, clothed the naked, visited the sick and the prisoners—these are the ones who are welcomed to the place prepared for them. So in the earlier chapters of the Koran we find good works specified as the reason why some enter Paradise. They are the ones who have kept themselves pure, who have set the captives free, who have nourished the orphans, and the poor.† Faith appears, but it appears as one among many virtues. As time goes on, its fundamental importance seems to

* Koran 57². cf. 91²⁵ f.

† 76⁸, 87¹⁴ f, 92⁵.

emerge more distinctly. The great obstacle which met the Prophet revealed itself as unbelief; and conversely, the distinctive mark of those who accepted the new religion was seen to be faith. After the very earliest period of his ministry, therefore, he adopted fully the declaration: "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

The Arabic word which Mohammed used to express the idea of faith is essentially the same word used both in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in the Syriac translation of the New Testament. He used it to describe (historically) the state of mind of the prophets, his predecessors, and those who followed them. It is Abraham especially who is the example of faith: "Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian, yet he was pious, resigned, and not an idolater. The nearest of men to Abraham are those who follow him—that is: the Prophet [Mohammed] and *those who believe*." "Who is more excellent in the matter of religion than he who resigns himself to God, who does good works and follows the way of Abraham the pious, whom God took as His friend."* The thought is evidently borrowed from the New Testament. And our first definition of faith is taken from the behavior of Abraham—*he was not an idolater*. That is to say: Faith is acceptance of the proposition that there is no God but one. "Abraham said to his father: I am pure from the service which you render."† That Mohammed did not mean the *mere* intellectual faith, however, is evident from other passages, such as the following: "The believers *commit*

* Koran 3⁶⁰ f, 4¹²⁴.

† 43²⁵.

themselves to God; and why should we not commit ourselves to Him, when He has guided us on our ways?" * Other passages which speak of the believers taking God as their protector imply that their faith is *trust* in Him.†

The man who believes in God must believe the messenger of God and his message. God and His Apostle are often joined together as the object of faith; so are God and His revelation. Or, faith may be spoken of as belief in the Apostle or in the revelation, where belief in God is implied. As with us, belief in the Word necessarily includes belief in God. This faith is assent to the truth of the message. The most frequent charge against the unbelievers is that they accuse the revelation of falsehood. Examples are so numerous that I need not quote.‡

In other passages faith is defined as believing in God and the Last Day,§ or simply as believing in the life to come. Believers are once described as *having*

* Koran 14¹⁴ f.

† 5²¹.

‡ It is perhaps an evidence of the affinity of Mohammed's doctrine with that current among Christians that he found the Christians the most ready to receive him: "Thou wilt find the nearest in friendship to the believers those who call themselves Christians. This is because they have priests and monks, and are not arrogant. When they hear what is revealed to the Prophet, thou wilt see their eyes overflow with tears on account of the truth which they recognize, while they say: Our Lord, we believe! Enroll us among those who testify [to the truth]. And why should we not believe in God and in the truth which has come to us, and [why should we not] desire that our Lord may place us among the righteous?" 58⁶ f. We can hardly suppose the words to have been spoken without some basis in fact.

§ 2⁵⁹.

assurance of the life to come, and once as *believing in the unseen*. The unbelief which opposed Mohammed made its stand on this point more obstinately than on any other. That men should be restored to life with fully reconstructed bodies after once becoming dust and mouldering bones, they would not believe, and, indeed, they ridiculed so absurd a proposition. The preacher had often to denounce the guilt of such unbelief. Conversely, faith in the future life is often mentioned in connection with faith in God and His Apostle: "Those who believe in the future life believe [also] in the Koran, and are watchful unto prayer."* And again: The believers, all of them, believe in God and His angels, and His Books and His Apostles—without distinguishing between the Apostles—and they say: We have heard and we obey! Grant us Thy forgiveness, O Lord; unto Thee we tend.† Faith, then, is not a mere intellectual assent to certain propositions; it is a disposing of the will toward the Author of the revelation, with a desire to obey His commands.

We can readily understand now, why faith and good works are so often mentioned together. *They who believe and do good works* is the most frequent phrase descriptive of the righteous. More elaborate descriptions are such as the following: "The good does not consist in turning your faces to the East or the West. But good is he who believes in God and the Last Day, and the angels and the Book and the Prophets; and who for the love of Him gives his property to his kinsmen, and to the orphans, and the

* Koran 6 2.

† 2²⁸⁵.

poor, and the wayfarer, and the mendicant, and for freeing slaves; and who observes prayer and who gives alms, and [good are] those who fulfil their engagements when they have made them, and those who are patient in misfortunes and distresses and in the time of calamity. These are the righteous and these are they who fear God.”* Such descriptions show that Mohammed had reflected on the connection of faith and works. Faith and the fear of God are also joined together, as are faith and repentance. All this convinces us that Mohammed desired to awaken the affection of the heart and draw it toward God. “Those only believe Our words† who, when they are reminded of them, fall prostrate and utter the praise of their Lord; who do not exalt themselves; whose bodies do not rest upon their beds, because they call upon their Lord in fear and in desire.”

In practice, and when he had become ruler of a state, the Prophet recognized that the profession of the lips was all that he could require from men. In this he was doing what political leaders are obliged to do. But what has been said, shows that his ideal was very near the one set forth in the Bible. Where he says that the hearts of believers find rest in making mention of God,‡ we are reminded of the Biblical promises of peace to the believer. The tradition which declares that the intention makes the quality

* Koran 2¹⁷².

† *Our signs*, where *signs* is put for the verses of the Koran. The passage is 32¹⁵ f.

‡ 13²⁸.

of the action* is very near the Old Testament declaration that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." Again, a tradition gives the following: "Mohammed said: None of you believes until he loves his brother as he loves himself."† New Testament influence is the more marked, that the Peshito has *thy brother* for *thy neighbor* in the second great commandment. And again: "None of you believes until I am dearer to him than his father and his child."‡ We remember that Jesus also said: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Once more: "Mohammed said: There is a piece of flesh in the body [of which it is true that] when it is right, the whole body is right, and when it is unsound the whole body is unsound."§ *Out of the heart are the issues of life* is the parallel declaration of the Gospel.

Islam is another name for faith; or, where a distinction is made, *Islam* is the outward profession; *Iman* (faith) is the inward state. Mohammed says of the Bedawin: "The Arabs say: We believe. Say to them: Nay you do not believe, you should say rather: We have accepted Islam,|| for faith has not yet entered your hearts." He knew his Arabs and knew that the great part of them had made an external submission to his rule while their hearts were unchanged. Still, as the submission may be the expression of sincerity, *Islam* is not infrequently used

* *Bochari*, I., p. 2. † *Ibid.*, p. 8. Cf. Matt. 22³⁹ (Peshito).

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 9. Cf. Matt. 10³².

§ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

|| *Aslamna, we are resigned.* The passage is 49¹⁴.

for faith: "When [Abraham's] Lord said to him: Be resigned! he replied: I am resigned to the Lord of the universe." When Abraham went to offer his son, the son encouraged his father, promising to be patient—"And when both had [thus] resigned themselves, he threw him upon his face but We called to him." * As submission to the will of God, Islam is a principle common to the three great religions. The Jews and Christians claim to have been resigned (Moslems) before the coming of Mohammed † It follows that Mohammed did not intend to make Islam the distinguishing principle of his religion. He identified his religion with Judaism and Christianity. In all three, *faith* was the principle in the heart, Islam the profession with the lips. In the New Testament also, "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." ‡

But what is the salvation secured by those who believe? Most prominently it is deliverance from punishment. As we have seen, the future state bulks largely in the preaching of Mohammed. He had no timidity in painting either the joys of the blessed or the torments of the doomed. The thought of the Judgment was the overmastering thought of his earlier career, and the motive for his preaching. That he was here under Christian influence needs no demonstration. To modern taste his appeal to the fear of punishment is made too prominent. But it is doubtful whether it would have seemed so to the Church of the Middle Age.

* Koran 2¹²⁵, 37¹⁰⁸.† 28^{52 f.}‡ Rom. 10¹⁰.

We should wrong Mohammed, however, if we supposed his conception of salvation to be merely external. The happiness of the believer consists in obtaining the forgiveness of God, and this forgiveness is valued for itself—not because it secures entrance to Paradise. The wrath of God rests on sinners, but He forgives those who believe. So he has manifested His grace in the past. When David was reproved by a parable—"then he discovered how We had tested him and, falling prostrate, he begged forgiveness of his Lord and repented; and We forgave him his sin, and he had access to Us, and an excellent refuge."* Of true believers it is said: "These, when they have done wrong or harmed their souls, remember God and ask forgiveness for their sins (and who forgives sins except God?) and do not persist in what they have done, when they know [its harm]; their portion is forgiveness from their Lord, and Gardens in which flow perennial streams."† Although the future reward is mentioned here, the forgiveness is evidently regarded as a good in itself. And we can scarcely doubt the spiritual emphasis of such a passage as the following: "If you love God follow me, and God will love you and forgive your sins—God is loving and gracious."‡ It is related in a tradition that Mohammed was accustomed to pray for forgiveness seventy times a day; and that he said: "There are three things possessing which a man finds the sweetness of faith: that Allah and His Prophet are dearer to him than anything besides them; that he loves the man who is loved by none

* Koran 38²³.† 3¹²⁹.‡ 3²⁹

but God; and that he dreads returning to unbelief as he dreads being thrown into the fire.”* The motive here urged is the sweetness of a complete faith considered by itself, and not looking for another reward.

But while we find some indications of a real spiritual apprehension of religion, it must be confessed that the emphasis of Mohammed is placed largely upon externals. His imagination was unequal to the task of describing pure spiritual joys except under sensuous images. Hence comes the wearisome repetitions in his picture of the rewards of heaven. In laying so much stress upon the rewards of piety, he fell short of the New Testament ideal. And this is accounted for largely by his conception of revelation as a law. It is indeed a grace of God, that men are pointed to the right path. They do attain salvation by following the direction thus imparted. But in practice, this means that their salvation consists in the performance of ceremonies, whose only reason is that they are enjoined by God. A treatise of Moslem theology which represents the established orthodoxy † says the foundations of Islam are five, to wit: (1) the confession that there is no God but Allah and that Mohammed is His Apostle, (2) the observance of prayer, (3) the giving of alms, (4) the observance of Ramadhan, and (5) the performance of the pilgrimage. Four parts of religion out of five therefore consist in external observances. This is no

* *Bochari*, I., p. 9.

† *Compendium Theol. Moham.* apud Reland. *De Relig. Moham.*, p. 5.

doubt an exaggerated statement, as compared with what Mohammed himself would have said. But he opened the way to such a conception by presenting his revelation as a legal system. Here is one of the points in which he failed to rise to the New Testament view, and in which his system more nearly resembled the legalism into which the Jews fell by their one-sided emphasis of their Tora.

But while admitting that Islam did not rise to the height of the Gospel, we must remember that the Christianity of that day did not rise to the height of the Gospel either. The early Church saw in the New Testament a new Law of essentially the same nature with the old.* This being the conception which Mohammed received from the Christianity of his time we cannot wonder that he adopted it, especially as circumstances emphasized the need of a strict code. He had to do with men converted from heathenism. They were men little used to self-control. As a matter of state policy, he was obliged to provide them with specific rules of conduct, and to enforce obedience by supernatural sanctions. His rules were not as restrictive as those of Judaism, but the principle on which the system was based was really the same.

The result of placing the revelation in this position has been to make Islam the most conservative system the world has ever seen. Mohammed was, as he himself claimed, the last of the prophets—the seal of that long line of messengers. His revelation is therefore the final revelation, and being a law for all rela-

* Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., p. 140.

tions of life, civil, social, and individual, these cannot change because it cannot change.* There is no power which can amend it, because it is a transcript from the heavenly tablet, and no one now has access to the original. The Pentateuch and the Gospel are indeed from the same exalted source. But in their present form these are open to suspicion as having possibly been corrupted by those who have them in charge. The authentic law is the Koran ; and faith in God means obedience to this law. Multitudes of earnest and conscientious men are making it the aim of their lives to conform to this law. They actually attain a high degree of virtue measured by the standard of the Middle Age ; and their conscientious fidelity to principle must command our respect, measure it by what standard we will. But their devotion to the light which came to their ancestors nearly thirteen hundred years ago, shuts their eyes to the light of the present time. All the wonderful progress of which we boast, is to them only apostasy from the truth of God. Hence arises the tragedy of the East—a tragedy at which the civilized world stands aghast to-day, and the last act in which, it is to be feared, is not yet played.

This is not the place in which to discuss this subject at length. Our topic is sin and salvation, and we have discovered in this as in the other parts of

* The traditions rightly express the mind of Islam when they make Mohammed say : " Verily the best word is the word of God ; and the best rule of conduct is that delivered by Mohammed, and the worst of all acts are those which are innovations . . . and every innovation is abandoning the right road."—*Mishcat*, I., p. 44.

Mohammed's doctrine a decisive Biblical influence. His system is that of the Old and New Testament, so far as he was able to adapt it to the people with whom he came in contact. To a considerable extent he apprehended the doctrine of salvation by faith. But he hampered his system by tying faith down to a code which, under the guise of an unchangeable revelation, made the customs of his time a matter of perpetual obligation.

LECTURE VIII.

THE SERVICE OF GOD

THERE is probably no religion which has not some ethical quality. There are always moral obligations imposed by the gods, even in heathenism. In Arab heathenism we have examples, in those engagements to which the gods were themselves party. When a treaty was made between two tribes, the solemn act was performed at a sanctuary, and the deity was made a contracting party. This was done in the belief that he would punish the party which broke its engagement. The gods were therefore protectors of oaths. To a certain extent they were also helpers of the helpless. Fugitives, upon whom the guilt of blood rested, found an asylum at the sanctuary, and the god became their patron. But in general, what we know of the gods of the Arabs does not impress us with their high moral character. They do not appear as the judges of conduct except where their own rights are invaded—as in the cases already specified. The morality which existed was developed without their influence. It was the result of social forces working independently. For example, the heathen Arab was strong in endurance. The scanty nourishment of the desert enforces this as a lesson of nature. To the present day among the Bedawin the chiefest

virtue is patience — “a courageous forbearing and abiding of hunger.”* So it was before Mohammed. There were no religious motives brought to bear upon the conscience in favor of this virtue. Public opinion and the individual affections were enough. So it was with the martial virtues. Tribal society lives in a state of warfare. In such a society, courage in battle, fidelity to the blood, self-sacrifice for the clan (or even for its lowliest members) easily become the ideal of nobility, without the aid of religion. So it was in Arab heathenism. The *hospitality* for which the Bedawy has become famous, is another social virtue whose roots can be traced as far back as our knowledge of Arab heathenism goes. And this hospitality was not only exercised toward the passing guest—it flowed constantly for the needy. The songs of Hudhail speak of “Chalid to whom came for support widows who found no abiding place among their kinsfolk.”†

We are the more bound to recognize the virtues of heathenism, that the Moslems have no eye for them. The revolution produced by Islam allows them to think of the virtues of their ancestors only as brilliant vices. In reality they were more than this, and the best of them were adopted by the new religion. The characteristic thing, however, is, that in heathenism they were independent of religion; in Islam they were brought into vital connection with it.‡ The

* Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, I., p. 252, quoting from Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*.

† Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, I., p. 109.

‡ The Meccans, when exhorted to obey Allah, reply that they obey (not their gods but) the customs of their fathers. Goldziher, *l. c.*, I., p. 10.

change was made possible by the new doctrine of the unity of God ; it was actively fostered by the scheme of future rewards and punishments. In Islam the will of Allah becomes the supreme rule of life. The believer, becomes, by his faith, a servant whose only motive is to inquire his Lord's will and to perform it. Why that will is so, and not otherwise, does not concern him. Mohammed describes himself and his motive to virtue when he speaks of himself as a grateful servant. We remember that the Apostle Paul also liked to call himself the bond-servant of Jesus Christ.

All conduct comes under this point of view. There is no distinction between ceremonial law and moral law. The servant is to do what he is bid, whether it be to abstain from killing game when on a pilgrimage, or to avoid adultery and murder. Ritual and ethics come under the same head—all conduct is ritual, or all is ethical, as you please to view it. That this is also the view of the Old Testament is evident. The commands of the Pentateuch are given without distinction into classes, and all are motived in the same way. Israel is a people set apart to the service of God. The service consists in obedience to His revealed will—whether the command be to abstain from pork or to abstain from murder. This is precisely what is meant by calling Israel a holy (consecrated) people. Mohammed had the idea, and possibly expressed it in similar language. The New Testament has the idea but spiritualizes it. The ritual of the Christian consists in visiting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction, and in keeping himself

unspotted from the world. But the Church has not yet risen to the height of this ideal. Certainly in the time of Mohammed it stood with the Synagogue in emphasizing ritual quite as much as morality.

It is for convenience only, therefore, that I discuss the service of God under the two heads of *ritual* and *ethics*. The distinction has no basis in Islam itself. In both divisions of the subject we see the curious interplay of two factors—one the influence of the old heathenism, the other the influence of the earlier revealed religions. Mohammed seems to have desired a more complete break with heathenism than he was actually able to effect. An example is the *kibla*—the point toward which the worshipper turns in prayer. When he went to Medina he fixed Jerusalem as this central point. But he found it impossible to maintain the regulation. Either because of his own affection for the ancestral sanctuary, which he had already recognized as the House of God,* or in order to strengthen his cause with the Arabs, he changed his Kibla to Mecca after about a year. The incident is typical of his career. At the beginning he was inclined to make a radical departure from heathenism. In the end he had adopted a considerable portion of its ritual.

This is further exemplified in the rites of pilgrimage and sacrifice. These, as he adopted them, were taken from heathenism rather than from Judaism—though not without analogies in Judaism. In adopting sacrifice, he was careful to disavow its heathen significance. The most natural interpretation of such

* In Sura 106.

a rite is that the God partakes of the offering. Against this Mohammed pronounces : " As for the sacrificial animals, We have made them to be a part of the rites of God, in which is a benefit. Therefore pronounce the name of God over them as they stand in rows ; and, when they are slain, eat their flesh and feed the contented [poor] and the one who is ashamed to ask. Thus We have made the cattle submissive to you, perhaps you may be grateful. *Their flesh and their blood do not ascend to God*, but the piety shown by you ascends to Him—thus He has made them submissive to you, that you may praise God for the way in which He has led you." * These words contradict not only the theory that the sacrifice is a gift to God, but also the theory that it constitutes a sacramental meal, in which He partakes with the worshipper, and further, the theory that it is a propitiation for sin. Nothing is left except an undefined benefit to the believer, which was probably conceived of as the merit of having obeyed a command of God. Evidently Mohammed adopted as little of the ancient institution as he could adopt if he retained it at all, and we may suppose that in reducing it to such narrow limits, he was to some extent under Christian influence.

In immediate connection with sacrifice we must notice the pilgrimage. The only official sacrifices (if I may use this phrase) in Islam are offered in connection with the pilgrimage.† According to tradi-

* Koran, 22³⁷ f.

† Private sacrifice is offered when an infant is seven days old (the *akika*). Mohammed offered it for his grandsons, *Mishcat*, II., 316. For regulations prescribing the kind of animal to be sacrificed, cf. *Mishcat*, I., pp. 319, 321. The regular sacrifice (of the annual

tion it is incumbent on every Moslem, once in his lifetime, to visit the sanctuary at Mecca. Mohammed, who lived at Medina, seems to have intended that this should be done every year by those who were not specially hindered. In performing this duty the pilgrim wears a special garb from the time of entering the sacred territory. He makes the circuit of the Kaaba and takes part in other ceremonies, now carefully regulated by tradition, and, finally, he offers a sacrifice in the valley of Mina. He then shaves his head and resumes his ordinary clothing. The whole resembles what we find in Judaism, where it is incumbent upon the Israelite to visit the central sanctuary at stated times. Those Jews who were converted to Christianity did not abandon the custom, for we find the Apostle Paul resolved to keep the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem. With this precedent, we are not surprised to find pilgrimage established as a meritorious work in Christianity from very early times. Its prominence in the Middle Age and the influence which its interruption had in arousing Europe to the Crusades are well known. It is possible, therefore, that Mohammed, in establishing this rite, justified himself by both Jewish and Christian precedent. But the resemblance which its external features show to Judaism must not make us think that they are borrowed from Judaism. The resemblance is really owing to the older Semitic heathenism, upon which both Judaism and Islam rest. The shaving of the head, for example, which we find in Islam, and

Feast of Sacrifice) is offered at other places than Mecca. But this is because it is the day on which the pilgrims offer it.

of which we find examples both in the Old Testament and the New, is found also in Arabic heathenism. It is really a survival from the earliest Semitic heathenism of which we have any knowledge, in which the sacrifice of the hair played a prominent part.

Again, the donning of special garments at the sanctuary, which at first sight we think peculiar to Islam, has its analogies in many other religions. The command given to the Israelites to wash their clothes before the appearance of God at Sinai is based upon the same idea, and so is the exhortation of the Psalmist to worship in the *beauty of holiness*, by which he means the sacred vestments. The idea is, of course, that nothing ceremonially unclean should appear before God. In the later Old Testament law the laity are kept altogether from approaching the holy part of the Temple, so that this regulation is for them unnecessary. So much the more stringent is the command that the *priests* should approach God only in the consecrated garments.* On the other hand we are told that at Mecca, before the time of Mohammed, the pilgrims used to hire garments kept specially for them, and wear them in making the circuit of the Kaaba. The natural conclusion is that Mohammed did not borrow from the earlier revealed religions, but that he adopted the heathen custom, purging it of what seemed to him incompatible with the faith. The question of religious observances gave him some

* On these resemblances cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III., pp. 51 f., 106, who cites Gen. 35², II. Kings, 10²²; also W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 433, and what was said in Lecture II. above.

thought, even at Mecca, if we may judge by the Koran passage which says: "We have ordained for every nation rites which they observe. Let none dispute with thee in this matter, but pray to thy Lord—verily thou art in the straight path."* The theory that the early religion of Mecca went back to Abraham would involve the belief that the pilgrimage was divinely ordained, and this would easily be confirmed by what Mohammed knew of Jewish and Christian customs. The emphasis which he laid upon the matter of pilgrimage is indicated, and perhaps exaggerated, by the tradition which makes him say, that he who worthily performs the pilgrimage returns as innocent as he was the day his mother bore him.†

The next ritual observance which is prominent in Islam is *fasting*. It is a matter of common fame that the Mohammedan world observes the month of Ramadhan by abstaining from food during the daylight hours. It must be confessed that the month is now characterized as much by feasting at night as it is by fasting during the day, but this was hardly the intention of the founder. His idea seems to have been that as God is nearer to men at some *places* than He is at others, so He is nearer at some *times* than He is at others. Such a season should be marked by some special observances. With this he may have had the idea that a month of self-denial would be well pleasing to God. In regard to this rite we have less distinct testimony from Arabic heathenism than we have in regard to some of the others which have been

* Koran, 22⁶⁶, a Meccan sura according to the superscription.

† *Bochari*, II., p. 192.

mentioned. Certainly the direct precedent is found in Judaism and in Christianity. Tradition distinctly asserts that Mohammed first established a fast in imitation of the Jews. When he came to Medina* he found them observing the Day of Atonement, and in imitation of them he commanded his followers to observe the same day in the same way. In the following year, however, he appointed Ramadhan as a month of fasting. There is no Jewish fast of this extent, and as in that year he began to show his independence of the Jews, he was probably influenced by the Christian Lent. There can be no question that he believed a precedent set in other religions: "O, believers, fasting is ordained for you as it was ordained for those before you, that you may observe piety."† That a month should be the time fixed, instead of forty days, need not cause surprise. The forty days had no special significance in Islam, and in fact was not constant in Christianity, whereas Mohammed was already familiar with the idea of a sacred month or months in heathenism. His sense of the importance of the moon as a measure of time was very marked. He not infrequently alludes to the moon's being created for this purpose, and he went so far as to rearrange the calendar, making his year a strictly lunar year. This was undoubtedly a misfort-

* The day is called Ashura (Tenth) and is still observed by some zealous Moslems. Bochari, who gives this tradition, gives another to the effect that the Koreish also fasted on that day in heathen times. But this requires confirmation. Cf. *Bochari*, II., p. 231; *Mishcat*, I., p. 486.

† Koran, 2¹⁷⁹.

une for the Moslem world, but we can trace the reasoning which led to the action. God had made the moon for seasons. Out of every twelve months which make a year He has made certain ones sacred. By the intercalation of a month—which was the Meccan device for making the solar and lunar year keep in harmony—these were thrown out of their proper place: “The number of months in the sight of God is twelve, written in the Book of God on the day when He created heaven and earth. . . . Postponement [of the sacred months by intercalation] is only excess of infidelity. The infidels lead astray by it, making a month profane one year and making [the same month] sacred another year, that they may agree with the number of months * which God has made sacred. Thus they profane what God has consecrated. The evil of their deeds is beautiful in their eyes, but God does not direct the people of unbelievers.” With this high idea of the month as the unit of time, it is natural that the Prophet should order his fast accordingly. This gives us no light on the meaning of the observance, but the passage quoted above seems to show that it was a means of showing piety. It is also brought into special connection with Gabriel’s visit to Mohammed, and this would agree with what has been said of its being a time when God comes nearer to men than He comes at other times.

We next come upon a religious regulation which is

* They agree in the *number* of months but do not observe the exact ones which God has designated, seems to be the meaning. The passage is 9³⁶ f.

so foreign to our modern thought that we have difficulty in entering into the state of mind which lies behind it—I mean the distinction between clean and unclean. From the Old Testament we have learned that there are certain things which the Hebrew could not touch, and certain acts which he could not do, without thereby becoming unfit for approach to God. This defilement extended over a longer or shorter period of time, according to its intensity, and could only be removed by a religious rite. Of the acts which render men unclean, the eating of certain kinds of food is one of the most prominent, and at first sight we think we discover the reason for this prohibition. Some of the forbidden objects are repulsive to our taste (mostly because we are unfamiliar with them) and we attribute like repulsion to the ancients. Or else we take refuge in sanitary hypotheses and suppose the animals prohibited to be deleterious to health. But it is doubtful whether either of these reasons will apply to any system of clean and unclean. The natural repulsion certainly does not exist among the peoples who are most affected by these laws; and considerations of health were foreign to their mode of thinking. The whole matter is a matter of religious regulation, and must be accounted for in the sphere of religion. When we give this consideration full weight, we see that clean and unclean are associated with the recognition of different gods. He who has consecrated himself by worshipping one god cannot immediately come into the presence of another god; his first consecration must be washed off, or at least worn off by the lapse of

time. All the more, where the god is conceived of as a jealous god like Yahweh. The marks of a rival deity upon a worshipper would make His anger flame out upon him. In Israel nearly all animals except the animals of the flock and herd were supposed to belong to some of the false gods or demons. They could not be eaten without bringing the worshipper into communion with these divinities. Even the enlightened Paul would not have his converts drink of the cup of the Lord and also of the cup of devils.

This Old Testament thought, which is also slightly shadowed forth in some New Testament passages, was familiar to Mohammed. Some regulations of this kind he adopted instinctively. He and his followers would not eat of flesh offered to idols, taking thus the position of the more scrupulous Christians in the Apostolic age. The point of view comes out clearly in the Koran prohibition: "Do not eat of that over which the name of Allah has not been pronounced, for this is sinful. The Satans come down to their companions to dispute with you, and if you eat of them you become idolaters." * The exact meaning of the phrase *the Satans come down to their companions to dispute with you* is uncertain. But it probably expresses Mohammed's belief that the demons are so associated with these offerings that the believers, in eating of the offerings, put themselves in the power of the demons—precisely the position of Paul just alluded to. Mohammed carried out the argument logically. His final decree forbids: "that which has

* Koran, 6¹²¹. According to Origen, the blood is the food of the demons. Cf. Conybeare in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, October, 1896, p. 61.

died [of itself], and blood, the swine, and that over which any name except the name of God has been pronounced, that which is strangled, that which is smitten down with a club, that which falls from a precipice, that which is gored, that which the beast of prey has torn (unless you are able to bleed it), and that which is sacrificed to idols."* Although the list gives a large number of items, we see that it is substantially covered by the New Testament principle. For the Council of Jerusalem laid upon Gentile Christians abstinence from things offered to idols, from things strangled, and from blood.

In view of what has been quoted from Paul there can hardly be any doubt as to the reasoning upon which this decree is based. The things offered to idols are the property of the demons. The Christian by eating of them comes into communion with the demons. But he thereby loses communion with God. Things strangled are forbidden for the same reason as that for which blood is forbidden. The blood belongs to God and is unlawful to man—if it cannot be sacrificed it must at least be carefully separated from the flesh. All Mohammed's list may be explained on this very principle—that blood and idol sacrifices are unlawful. In this he considerably modified the Old Testament law, dealing freely with it, as he did in some other cases we have noticed,† but influenced also by New Testament precedent.

* Koran, 5⁴.

† Tradition increases the list of prohibited foods. The ass was added toward the close of Mohammed's life. He himself refused to eat some things which he allowed to his followers. Possibly he was influenced by his habit acquired in youth. For the distinc-

The means ordinarily used to remove ceremonial defilement is water. For the Moslem, therefore, the ablution is one of the most important parts of the service of God. The Koran commands: "O, believers, when you are ready for worship, wash your faces and your hands as far as the elbows, and wipe your heads, and [wash] your feet as far as your ankles."* In addition to this, which is the ordinary ablution, a full bath is ordered for certain kinds of defilement—as was the case in Judaism. The subject interests us here only as it is connected to all appearance with the Old Testament and Rabbinical washings, rather than with Christian Baptism. Baptism is referred to but once in the Koran, if indeed it is referred to at all.† It is possible however that Mohammed's practice was influenced not by the Jews alone, but by the various Gnostic or Pseudo-Christian sects which insisted on frequent baptisms or ablutions.‡

We come now to the most important part of the Mohammedan ritual—the act of worship which we call *prayer*. This is hardly an exact rendering, as when we speak of prayer, we think most prominently of

tion of clean and unclean in Arab heathenism cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III., p. 52.

* 58. The command to *wipe the head* means to draw the wet hands over the head. Had the main verb continued its force over this clause it would have enjoined *scrubbing* the head. On the whole subject cf. Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, c. III.; Reland, *De Religione Mohammedanica* (1717), pp. 66–77; Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, Articles *Ablution* and *Ghusl*.

† Koran, 2¹³² is usually supposed to name Christian Baptism.

‡ The Elkesaites and Mandæans (probably the Sabæans of the Koran) are among these sects. Cf. Herzog, P. R. E.³, IV., p. 185.

supplication. But the *galat* of the Moslem does not contain any large element of supplication. It is an act of divine service, an act performed for the glory of God and in obedience to Him. Like other parts of the ritual it is not left to the discretion of the believer, but is carefully regulated by tradition, both as to the times when it is to be performed, and as to the ceremonies which must be observed. Five times in the day, the believer must perform this act of devotion, wherever he may be; and Christian travellers in the East have frequent occasion to admire the fidelity with which the Moslem turns aside from his business or his amusement to show his obedience to his Maker.

It is unnecessary to describe the postures which are enjoined by tradition for this service. The believer stands, bows, kneels, and prostrates himself with his forehead touching the ground. These acts follow a certain sequence making up a *rekah* or prostration. A prayer (to use the conventional term) is made up of at least two prostrations, and the number may be increased to ten or more. In these various postures the worshipper repeats portions of the Koran* and ejaculations of praise. At certain points he declares his belief in the unity of God and the apostleship of Mohammed. At the close he salutes the angels to his right and left. The chief content of what the believer recites is the *praise of God*. When Mohammed was asked why he spent so much

* Including always the Fatiha or opening chapter. Other portions are chosen according to taste. The ejaculations are: "Praise be to God!"—"I extol the perfection of God the Great."

time in devotion, he replied : " Shall I not be a thankful servant ? " Worship then is the recognition of God's goodness and of His Kingship. It is not man alone who praises his Maker. The whole creation joins in ascriptions to Him : " Dost thou not see that whatever is in heaven and on earth praises God, even the birds with expanded wings ? Each knows its worship [*ḡalat*] and its doxology, and God regards what they do." * Such expressions are frequent in the Koran, and they show what Mohammed regarded as the proper service of the creature.

The importance of worship was rated very highly by Mohammed. He came out of the house one day in winter when leaves were falling from the trees. He took two branches from a tree, and the leaves began to drop from them. Remarking this, he said to his companion : " Believers say their prayers for the satisfaction of God, and their faults drop from them like the leaves from these branches." † In another tradition he is represented as saying that the most pleasing thing to God is prayer at its appointed times. Again, he called prayer a *Kaffara*, that is an atonement, which covers sins from the sight of God. In another place he says : " If one washed five times a day in a river which flowed at his door, how much filth would remain upon him ? So God washes away sin by the five daily prayers." If we may believe tradition further, he carried his view of the importance of prayer to such an extreme as to say a man is justified in repulsing one who interrupts his prayers even if he thereby kills him. As it is added *for he is a*

* Koran, 24¹¹.† *Mishcat*, I., p. 130.

Satan, we may suppose that Mohammed was disturbed in his devotions by the evil one in visible form—the parallel with Luther will occur to every one. Other traditions affirm that he had often to contend against the distraction of his thoughts in his devotions, and that he ascribed this to Satan. In the tradition before us, therefore, he was only counselling strenuous resistance to such an interrupter of prayers; against a diabolical enemy one may use any violence.*

Another evidence of Mohammed's estimate of the value of the prescribed worship is seen in another tradition. This is to the effect that Moslems who are condemned to hell will be known by the callouses made upon their knees by their habit of prayer, for over these spots the fire will have no power; and men thus marked will finally be redeemed from the place of torment.

Turning now to the question where Mohammed got his idea of worship, we cannot doubt that he got it from a Christian source. Any one who has seen public service in the Eastern Church, in any of its branches, will have noticed how the congregation take part by kneeling, bowing, crossing themselves, and joining in the responses. Very likely in some of his journeyings Mohammed had seen such a service. If not, we can readily suppose that his Christian friends at Mecca would exemplify such a service. The sacraments, of course, they could not illustrate, not being priests; and these, being mysteries of the faith, they would be shy even of describing to a foreigner. With such elements as they gave him,

* The examples are taken from *Bochari*, I., pp. 123 f., 119.

Mohammed arranged a ritual for himself. Its elements were the various attitudes of worship exemplified by the Christians, and such words of praise as were recited by them from the Psalms. With no mind for mysteries or a priesthood, the Prophet found his simple liturgy sufficient for himself, and for the community that gathered about him.

The number of five prayers daily has no direct Biblical precedent. Daniel seems to have prayed three times daily, and the Psalmist specifies morning, evening, and noon as the times of prayer. It is a curious coincidence that the only passage of the Koran which gives the number of prayers also specifies three: "Perform worship at the setting of the sun, up to the darkness of night, and the Recitation of the dawn (the recitation of the dawn is witnessed by the angels), and in the night. Awake to prayer, therefore, perchance thy Lord will prepare for thee a glorious place." * Exegesis has found a way to make these verses prescribe the five customary seasons, but on their face they speak of only three. In the Church the canonical hours vary from three to seven daily. The Manichæans are said to have had four and the Mandæans five.† It is possible that Mohammed's own custom varied at different times. Tradition says that in the Night-journey, God commanded him at first fifty prayers daily. At the advice of Moses, who had had experience with human weakness, he asked successive reductions of the number until it was

* Koran, 17⁸⁰ f, cf. Ps. 55¹⁸.

† Herzog, P. R. E², IX., p. 241. Brandt, *Mandäische Religion*, p. 92, ascribes seven to the Mandæans.

brought down to five. We have already seen an ascetic tendency in Mohammed's earlier impulse. It is possible that he began with the observance of more frequent hours of worship than he was able to keep up in his later practice. In fact he has supplemented one of his early revelations with a command to moderate the excesses of his devotion (73²⁰).

Although the regular prayers are largely formal, we must not forget that Islam encourages voluntary prayers. I do not refer here to works of supererogation, to which pious Moslems are much addicted. When Mohammed says: "And remember thy Lord in thy soul in humility and fear, and without raising the voice," * we can hardly suppose he means to command the constant *repetition* of the name of God which forms the worship of the dervishes. He is, rather, encouraging the believer in communing with God. He laid stress on the correct performance of prayer, but he also laid stress on the intention. He was accustomed himself to offer voluntary petitions, both after the regular prayers and at other times. He gives in the Koran examples of prayer, and these are real prayers; that is, petitions for blessings both spiritual and temporal, the spiritual being prominent. For example: "O Lord do not punish us for our sins of negligence or for our errors; and do not lay upon us a law such as Thou didst lay upon those who preceded us: † O Lord do not enjoin upon us that for which we have not the ability; blot out our

* Koran, 7²⁰⁴.

† He means the Children of Israel, whose Law he thought burdensome. The verse is 2³⁸⁶.

sins and forgive us; be gracious to us, Thou our Lord, and aid us against a people of unbelievers." It seems impossible to suppose such a prayer composed without a vivid sense of sin, and without assurance that God is the rewarder of those who seek Him. In another verse of the same chapter we read: "When My servants ask thee concerning Me—then verily I am near, and I answer the petition of the worshipper when he prays to Me; then let them seek Me and believe in Me that they may walk in the right way."* The example of the Prophet was in accordance with this, for he embodied in his daily worship petitions for himself and his friends. There is a tradition which even affirms that a man shut out of Paradise could get in by importunate prayer. But it is doubtful whether this correctly represents the mind of Mohammed. As to the efficacy of prayer in the present life, however, he seems to have had no doubt.

So much for that part of the service of God which consists in ritual. We cannot deny that in the religious law too much emphasis is laid upon external observances. But what has just been said is enough to show that mere formality was not Mohammed's ideal. He desired to foster spiritual faith and unfeigned piety. Turning now to the other side of the service of God, what we include under the head of morals, we discover that there was a great advance over heathenism, in that the sense of responsibility to God was enforced by all the preaching of Mohammed: "A man is a shepherd, and what is committed to him (as his family and his property) is his flock and he will be

* Koran, 2¹⁰².

inquired of concerning it in the Last Day—even a slave will give account of the way in which he has administered his master's property." * The tradition reminds us of the New Testament parable of the talents, and we cannot doubt that the thought is the same: Man is responsible to his Maker, and for all his actions he must give account.

The distinctly ethical character of the obligation thus laid upon men is seen on almost every page of the Koran. Several extended passages might be quoted which were evidently intended to set forth the whole duty of man. Let me quote just one:

“The servants of the Compassionate are they who walk humbly on the earth, and, when the barbarians address them, say: Peace be with you! And [they are they] who pass the night prostrate before their Lord or standing [in prayer]; and who say: Our Lord avert from us the punishment of Gehenna, for its punishment is lasting and it is an evil place of abode; who, when they expend, are neither lavish nor niggardly but maintain a just mean between the two; who do not call upon any God in the presence of Allah; and who do not slay human beings—which God forbids—except in the cause of justice; and who do not commit adultery, for whoever does this shall incur punishment (his pain shall be doubled in the Day of Resurrection, and he shall be an object of contempt forever, unless he repent and believe and do good—as for such, God will exchange their evil deeds for good deeds; God is forgiving and compassionate, and he who repents and does good is sincere in his turning towards God). And [they are they] who do not bear false witness; and, when they pass by vain discourse, pass by in honor; and who, when they are told of the revelations of their Lord, do not depart [as though]

* *Bochari*, I., p. 198.

deaf and blind ; and [they are] those who say : Our Lord, give us comfort in our wives and children, and make us an example to those who fear Thee. These shall be recompensed with Paradise* because they have endured ; and there shall they obtain life and peace. Beautiful is such a place of abode ! ” †

Such passages show the distinctly ethical character of Islam ; and the fact that the virtues here commanded may easily be classified under ten heads, makes us inquire what influence the Decalogue had on the thought of Mohammed. We easily discover that he had some knowledge of the fundamental Ten Words, though he nowhere calls them by this name. He endeavors to reproduce them in the following passage addressed to the Jews :

“ Come, I will repeat what your Lord forbade you to do ; [He commanded] that you should not associate anything with Him ; and [He commanded] good conduct towards parents ; and do not kill your children on account of poverty—We will nourish you and them—and do not ap-

* Literally : *a high place*, meaning apparently the most exalted of the heavens.

† Koran, 25⁶⁴⁻⁷⁶. In the Traditions we find some resemblance to the Christian classification of seven deadly sins : “ Flee the seven that cast into hell. They asked what these were and he replied : Polytheism, magic, murder, usury, devouring the property of orphans, fleeing in time of war, and accusing chaste women of unbecoming conduct.” *Bochari*, III., p. 179. Mohammed said also : “ There are seven whom God will shade with his shadow in the day when there will be no other shade than His : a just ruler, a young man who grows up in the service of God, a man whose heart cleaves to the mosques, two men who love each other for the love of God, a man who resists temptation by the fear of God, and a man who gives alms and conceals it so that his left hand does not know what his right hand does.”—*Bochari*, II., p. 106.

proach anything evil, whether it be concealed or manifest ; and do not kill a human being (which God has forbidden except in accordance with justice, and He enjoined you this that you might have understanding); and do not approach the property of the orphan, except to his profit, until he reaches his majority ; and use a just measure and scale—We, on Our part, do not exact from any soul more than its ability; and when you speak be just, even to relatives : and keep the covenant of God. These things He commanded you that you should remember.”*

If we count up the separate commands embodied in this list we shall find them to be nine in number. In a tradition also we find that the Jews came to discuss with Mohammed concerning the *nine* commands of God. This is in fact the Jewish computation, for of the Ten Words in their division, the first is the opening announcement: I am Yahweh thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slaves. There are therefore nine commands. But when we examine the nine of Mohammed we see that they do not correspond with those of the Hebrew code. He left the Sabbath out of view altogether. He knows it, as we discover from other references, but he does not give it a place among God's commands. We easily discover the reason for this. The Sabbath is practicable only among agricultural or hand-working people. A pastoral people must herd the flocks and milk them seven days in the week, or their subsistence perishes. The Jew were an industrial people. Those at Medina were mainly cultivators or goldsmiths. They observed the Sabbath. But Mohammed's people were mainly Bedawin. It

* Koran, 6¹⁵² f.

seemed impossible to impose a day of rest upon them. He did not hesitate therefore to abrogate it—the Sabbath is intended only for the Jews, is in fact his round assertion.*

We see from this instance, that Mohammed did not feel that an unchangeable God would enact an unchangeable code. In regard to some other Mosaic regulations, he admitted their divine character but denied that they were binding upon later sects: “And for the sin of the Jews, We forbade them good things that had been lawful to them, and because they turned away from the path of God.”† We remember that in the New Testament also, some of the Mosaic ordinances are said to have been given the people for the hardness of their hearts. A polemic utterance against the Old Testament reason for the Sabbath, seems contained in the words: “We created the heavens and the earth and what is between them in six days, and no fatigue affected Us.”‡ It is scarcely possible to doubt that there is a reference here to the declaration that God *rested* the seventh day. Since neither the advantages of the Sabbath, nor the reason given for its observance, commended themselves to Mohammed, he refused to re-enact it. The Friday which he chose as his day of religious observance was not intended as a Sabbath in the Old Testament sense.

The first command of Mohammed's Decalogue for-

* “The Sabbath is made only for those who dispute concerning it”—by which he means the Jews who were arguing with him for its adoption—Koran, 16¹²⁵.

† 4¹⁵⁹.

‡ 50³⁷.

bids associating any other object of worship with the true God. With his doctrine of the unity of God this is what we may expect. And in his commonwealth, as soon as he was strong enough, he made this a crime to be punished by the judges. So in the Old Testament we find stringent measures commanded against every one who practised or encouraged the worship of false gods.* It follows that apostasy from Islam is punished with death: "If they turn their backs, then take them and kill them, and do not take any of them as friends or helpers."† This was probably intended for those who relapsed into heathenism after having professed Islam. It was early applied, however, to those Moslems who were converted to Judaism or Christianity. It is still the theory of Mohammedan law everywhere that such converts should be put to death.

The other commands of the Decalogue given by Mohammed cover very fairly the second table of Moses' Law. To appreciate his view of man's obligations toward his fellow we need to look at the difference in principle between him and the heathenism which he overthrew. In heathen Arabia, as in all early society, moral obligations were connected with the blood. The members of the clan were brothers. In such a society, virtue consists in acting for the common blood, either in defending it from attack from the outside, or in fostering it by liberality within. This tribal system was in full force in Mohammed's time even in Mecca, where the different clans lived in different quarters of the city, each with its

* Deut 13.

† Koran, 4²¹.

separate wall and gates. The common interest of the city was protected only by treaties between the clans. In Medina the different clans were frequently at war, and before the coming of Mohammed, a continuous feud had been carried on so long as to threaten the extermination of the population. Now Mohammed substituted the bond of faith for the bond of blood: "O, you who believe! Fear God in sincerity, and do not die without being resigned [to Him]; and hold fast, all of you, on the bond of God, and be not divided; and remember the grace of God towards you when you were enemies, how He united your hearts, and by His grace you became brethren." * The men whom he addressed had been members of different tribes and therefore enemies. The word of Paul concerning Christians before their conversion—that they had been full of hate—was true also of those whom Mohammed addressed. It is difficult for us to conceive the greatness of the change wrought in them by the substitution of the new tie of faith for the old tie of family. The greatness of the change is shown by the difficulty with which it was brought about. In the stormy times through which the infant commonwealth passed, it seemed again and again as if the old feuds would break out. But faith triumphed over the old bonds, and the brotherhood of believers was established. Tradition has preserved some striking instances of the reality of the change. One was the case of the son of Abdallah Ibn Obay. Abdallah had been the most influential man in Medina before the coming of Mohammed. Although he yielded to the majority, and professed allegiance

* Koran, 3rd f.

to Mohammed, he was never heartily a believer, and his lukewarmness or his secret machinations placed many a thorn in the pillow of Mohammed. At one time he so far forgot his ordinary prudence as to speak openly of Mohammed in abusive language. Thereupon the son went to Mohammed and offered to kill his father with his own hand, declaring that it was better for him to be the executioner than another—for if another should do it he would be moved to take blood revenge, and so become a transgressor. In another instance, a Moslem at Mohammed's instigation put to death a Jew who had shown him many favors in times past. The brother of the executioner reproached him with murdering his benefactor. The only reply was: "If he who ordered me to kill him should order me to kill thee I would obey." When the brother assured himself that this was said in earnest, he was so impressed with the power of the new religion, that he became a convert on the spot.* These examples show how the new principle was realized. They show its less attractive side, to be sure. But we cannot doubt that its strength against enemies is the measure of its strength within the community. In his farewell pilgrimage, Mohammed declared that, like the sacred month and the sacred territory, God had made the life and property of every Moslem inviolable to every other Moslem until the end of time.†

In adopting faith as the principle of his community instead of blood, Mohammed was probably under

* Wellhausen, *Vakidi*, p. 98.

† Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, IV., p. 239.

Christian influence. The social organization in view in the Old Testament was the chosen *people*. And this people was a group of clans allied by blood and tracing descent from a common ancestor—Abraham or Israel as the case may be. In substance this was the constitution of the Arabs before Mohammed. The Prophets, indeed, in their visions of the coming kingdom see that all men are to partake of the blessings of Israel. But they do not seem to proclaim that simple faith in Yahweh is enough to make all men kin. They are content to leave the great consummation to the future, where divine power will effect what is incomprehensible to men. It was the New Testament which brought believers into a brotherhood “where there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female.” Mohammed must have heard of this from Christians. The Jews who came under his observation were as exclusive as the heathen. They were in fact organized on the principle of the Arab clans, and they did not let their faith keep them even from warring against each other, clan against clan. Mohammed grasped the Christian idea of the brotherhood of believers and organized his society on that basis. That he did not rise to the height of the Christian conception of the brotherhood of all men can scarcely excite surprise, when we see how far the Church is from apprehending this conception even to the present day.

Christian influence is suggested further by various expressions used by Mohammed—though as we get our knowledge of them from tradition, we may suspect that they are colored somewhat by the memory

of the narrators. In regard to the brotherhood of believers, he is reported to have said: "Believers are like a building, one part of which strengthens another"—and he interlaced his fingers to illustrate the union of materials in a building. So in the New Testament, believers are *buildd together* into a temple. In some Koran passages he describes believers as those who *repel evil with good*, where we are tempted to see a reminiscence of the New Testament exhortation to overcome evil with good.

Some other verbal resemblances might be pointed out, but it is time for us to turn our attention to two subjects in which the Moslem world now sharply distinguishes itself from Christendom. The first of these is slavery. This institution already existed in full vigor in Arabia in the time of Mohammed. A slave market existed at Mecca into which came those Arabs who were made captive in the wars between the tribes, as well as the human merchandise imported from beyond the borders of the peninsula. Even in time of peace, a defenceless man might be kidnapped and sold. Mohammed did not dream of abolishing slavery. But he greatly mitigated its evils. He exhorted masters to clothe their slaves with the same kind of garments which they wore themselves, and to feed them with the same kind of food which they themselves ate. And he added as a reason: "They are your brothers whom God has made subject to you."* Further, he encouraged

* Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, I., p. 73. I have not now the reference to *Bochari*. On the slave market in Mecca cf. W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, p. 73; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, I., p. 119.

manumission, making it a meritorious work and recommending it as one of the means of atoning for sins of omission. Finally, by the emphasis of the brotherhood of believers he did much to secure mild treatment of slaves on the part of their masters. In all this, Islam did as much as was done either by Judaism or Christianity. Islam has, however, failed to keep up with the progress of humanity in this as in so many other respects. That, in the Middle Age, Christianity had little to boast of as compared with Islam, is shown by the fact that slaves were a staple of the Venetian trade to the East, and were exported from the domains of the Pope himself. Prelates even were accused of taking the children of their serfs and selling them to the Jews, through whose hands they passed into the possession of the Moslems.*

The other matter is one in which the custom of Islam is most repugnant to our ideas—I mean the law of marriage and divorce.† In our dislike of the present practice of Moslems, however, we must not forget that Mohammed did improve upon the customs of heathenism. Among the sins which he most strictly forbade was adultery. When the deputation from Me-

* Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, II., p.153.

† In addition to what has been said about the duties of man to man we should in justice to Islam notice the following points: (1) Honor to parents is emphasized, cf. Koran 17²⁴ f; (2) The punishment of the murder of a Moslem is death, and for injury of the person the *lex talionis* is enforced as in the Old Testament; (3) The payment of just dues is enforced, and (by tradition) trade is regulated so as to prevent unfairness; (4) Usury is prohibited as in the Old Testament.

dina swore allegiance to him before the Flight, he pledged them not to commit this sin.* When asked to name the three greatest crimes, this was one of the three.† In the passage cited above, he says: "Do not approach anything evil." He probably means to prohibit incitements to lust. He forbade the price of a dog, the reward of fornication, and the pay of a soothsayer—a conjunction that reminds us of an Old Testament prohibition. In the early part of his reign at Medina he ordered one of his followers to be stoned on confession of adultery. When a deputation from the important city of Taif came with the offer that the city would become Moslem if the commands against usury, adultery, and wine were modified, the Prophet refused any concession.‡ These are sufficient proof that Mohammed had no desire to encourage license, and that, in fact, his law was considerably more strict than the custom of his ancestors. His ideal of marriage was high, for he says: "A Moslem has not obtained, after righteousness, anything better than a good dispositioned, beautiful wife; such a wife as, when ordered by her husband to do anything, obeys; and if her husband looks at her, is happy; and, if her husband swears by her to do anything, she does it, to make him a swearer to the truth; and if he is absent from her she wishes him well and guards her person and takes care of his property."§

* Or fornication, the Arabic word includes both.

† Polytheism, infanticide, and adultery. *Mishcat*, I., pp. 8, 18, 20.

‡ Wellhausen, *Vakidi*, p. 383. In addition to these indications, I might adduce the tradition that Mohammed prohibited the *Muta* marriages—marriages for a specified time.

§ *Mishcat*, II. p. 79.

With such an ideal, it seems as if he might have done more for the elevation of marriage.

That he did not do more is probably due to his not having had knowledge of what Christianity really teaches. As we very well know, the Church early obscured the true doctrine of marriage by the prominence it gave to celibacy. Now the doctrine that marriage is inferior to celibacy is one from which the Arab revolts. The importance of preserving the family name, and of keeping up the strength of the clan, causes him to value children above all other blessings. He stands just where the Hebrews of the Old Testament stood. He has therefore no mind to the doctrine of the Church. "We sent Jesus the Son of Mary (he says in the Koran*) and gave him the Gospel, and placed in the hearts of those who followed him pity and compassion—but *the monastic life they themselves invented.*" This shows that Mohammed, finding the ideal presented by Christianity a perverted one, fell back upon the position common to Hebrews and Arabs. He justifies himself in his own polygamy by the example of the prophets who had preceded him, having David and Solomon especially in mind.

The real evil in Eastern society is not so much polygamy as the freedom of divorce. Comparatively few Mohammedans have more than one wife at a time. But there are comparatively few who have not put away more than one wife in order to take another. Now divorce was repugnant to Mohammed. He never sent away a wife, though some of them gave him anything

* Koran, 57²⁷.

but a peaceful time. He tried to regulate divorce, making it more difficult. That the attempted regulation would produce new evils he did not foresee. It did not occur to him that he could prohibit divorce—the disciples of Jesus also found it impossible to suppose such a prohibition practicable. In fact, Mohammed stood substantially upon Jewish ground, for the Jewish law allows the husband to put away his wife if he find any serious fault in her.*

A curious but not edifying phase of this subject, is the influence which Mohammed's own experiences with women had upon his legislation. As it does not bear directly upon our subject we need not discuss it here. Probably there is in all history no more striking example of the extent to which a regulation based on the experience of a single individual has affected a vast multitude of men for a long period of time.† The failure to distinguish between personal impulses and eternal laws has inflicted this lasting calamity on Eastern society.

In the last lecture we discovered that the revelation of Mohammed is regarded as a Law. What was there said is fully borne out by what we have seen

* Even if she burn the bread in baking, according to one school of Scribes.

† The jealousy of the uxorious old man led to the command that all women should wear veils, which is still the rule of Eastern society. The desire to shield his favorite wife from a scandal, produced the law that four witnesses should be brought to prove a charge of adultery, and the accuser who cannot produce these must receive eighty stripes. This law causes Eastern husbands to keep their wives under constant guard because of the difficulty of proving unfaithfulness. What the seclusion of women has done for Moslem society I need not say.

to-day. Koran and tradition occupy, to the Moham-medan, exactly the place which the Jew gives to Tora and Mishna. Life is to be regulated in its most minute details by the law given by God Himself. The conservatism which is thereby given to Islam has already been noticed. A further consequence is only too evident. The emphasis laid upon obedience to a set of rules, stimulates a formal and external righteousness. The process is precisely that illustrated in Judaism. On one side it becomes all important to know the law. The Koran, like the Tora, is a complicated code. It contains a great variety of enactments, and these are not always clear or self-consistent. Moreover, it does not provide for all cases of conscience. The traditions must be consulted by the man who wishes to please God ; and the traditions form an extensive literature. But we are not yet at the end. Cases in real life still force upon the believer questions that cannot be answered by direct declaration of either Koran or tradition. But it will not do to remain in doubt. Of two possible courses of action, one must be pleasing to God and the other not. The development of casuistry is the result. In fact the religious science of Islam is largely casuistry. The learned have the issues of life in their hands, and the result has been to foster the pride which in old times led the Scribes to say : "this people which knoweth not the Law is accursed."

In this respect, Islam has failed to rise to the New Testament view. As we have seen, its ethical ideal frequently shows Biblical influence. In the point

now under consideration it has adopted the one-sided legalism which characterized Pharisaism. The Scribes who sat in Moses' seat have their counterpart in the Scribes who still sit in the seat of Mohammed. The conscience of the Moslem world is still in the hands of these scholastics, whose ideal is the ideal of thirteen centuries ago.

And if, in this respect, Mohammedanism must be classed with Talmudic Judaism, the same must be said of the character of its morality. The works pleasing to God are largely works of the law—that is, they are ceremonial and external. If even in Christianity, which professes to free men from the law, men will take refuge in formalism, how much more must this be true in Islam! In fact, the righteousness of the followers of Mohammed consists in what the Apostle calls dead works. Here is where the system most needs regeneration, and here is where the spiritual light of Protestant Christianity should come to its help.

LECTURE IX.

THE FUTURE LIFE

WE have already had occasion to notice the prominence which the doctrine of the Judgment assumed in the system of Mohammed, and in connection with it the doctrine of the resurrection. In more than one place he intimates that the great stumbling-block which his message put in the way of his compatriots was the doctrine of the resurrection. The unbelievers are represented as saying to their friends: * “Shall we bring you to a man who tells that after you are scattered by the decay of your members, you will become new creatures?” Elsewhere the unbelievers are characterized as those who do not believe in the future life, while the believers are frequently described as those who believe in the future life—the *world to come* as we may well translate the word. † The stress of the message is laid upon this: “Let those who exchange the present life for the life to come, fight in the cause of God.” ‡ The idea that those who lose the present life in order to gain the other make a good bargain is also found in the New Testament. The future is in fact the true good, the present is only a delusion: “Say to them: The pres-

* Koran, 34¹.

† *Al-achira*: that which comes after this life, 2³, 6⁹² and often.

‡ 4⁷⁶.

ent life is a little thing, and the life to come is [the true] good to the one who fears God;” “The present life is only play and pastime, but the future home is better to those who fear God—do you not understand?”*

Belief in the future life is, then, one of the fundamentals of Moslem faith. How much this article of the creed includes to orthodox Mohammedans can be seen from the following synopsis of the chapters devoted to this subject in a treatise on theology: †

“*Section 64.* To show that the inquisition of Munkar and Nakir, and the punishment of the tomb, and its felicity, and all that is handed down concerning it, are true. . . . Followers of tradition assert that this inquisition of Munkar and Nakir comes to every man equally, whether he be buried, or devoured by beasts or by birds, or even if his dust be scattered by the wind.

“*Section 65.* To show that all the signs of the Hour, concerning which the Lawgiver has told us, are true, and that it is necessary that all of them come to pass before the coming of the Hour. These are: the appearance of the Mahdi, then of the Antichrist, then of Jesus; next the coming of the Beast, the rising of the sun in the west, the ascension of the Koran, the opening of the barrier of Gog and Magog. Though there remained for the world but the space of one day, all this would come to pass.

“*Section 66.* To show the necessity of a firm belief that God will restore us to life in the form in which he first brought us into it; and the possible modes in which the bodies shall receive the spirits; to explain the form of the Trumpet, and the reviving of those who are in the tombs.

“*Section 67.* To show that the assembly after the resur-

* Koran, 4th, 6³², cf. 13²⁶.

† From Flügel, *Scha'rânî und sein Werk über die Muhammedanische Glaubenslehre* in the Z. D. M. G., XX. (1866), pp. 22-24.

rection is true, and so of the change of the earth to another earth and also of the heavens [to other heavens]. As to the assembly, it is the collection of all created beings that they may appear before God and give account before Him. It extends to all creatures, both the distinguished and the vulgar. All the pious, the prophets, the saints, and the believers shall appear in the presence of the Compassionate, and the evil-doers of different classes shall assemble before the Almighty and the Avenger.

“*Section 68.* To show that the Pool and the Bridge and the Scales are true.

“*Section 69.* To show that the books kept by the recording angels are true and that they shall be laid before God in the day of resurrection according to the express traditions. But as to the records men have different lots : one shall hold his in his right hand, and another shall hold his in his left, and another shall hold his behind his back. Those who hold their books in their right hands are the different classes of believers ; those whose books are given into their left hands, these are the hypocrites, but not idolators ; those who hold their books behind their backs are those who received the Scripture but cast it behind them.

“*Section 70.* To show that our prophet Mohammed (God bless and save him) will be the first intercessor in the Day of Resurrection and the first whose intercession will be accepted and the best of them, and no one shall have precedence of him.

“*Section 71.* To show that Paradise and the Fire are true, and that they were created before Adam (peace be on him) as has been already set forth at large.”

The citation, though only from a synopsis, is enough to show the extent to which Mohammedan eschatology has been developed. The theologians have been obliged to find room in their system for every saying on this subject which is attributed to Mohammed by tradition, as well as every declara-

tion contained in the Koran. Their harmonistic efforts are evident enough in some sections of this treatise, as where those who receive the book of record are divided into three classes. This division is based on different texts of the Koran, in each of which only two classes of men are specified. Thus, we find in several instances that the good are called *men of the right* and the bad *men of the left*. These phrases are apparently borrowed from the Gospel account of the Judgment, in which the sheep are placed on the right hand and the goats on the left. Influenced by this phraseology we have in these passages the two classes designated as those who receive their book (or account) *in their right hand* or *in their left hand* as the case may be.* In another passage the one receives his book *in his right hand* and the other receives it *behind his back*.† It is clear that the Prophet meant by this various imagery to describe two classes and only two. But the literalism of the theologians compels them to adopt a scheme which will allow all the texts to be literally true—hence the three classes in our author's presentation.

So extended and well-ordered a system as is here presented was not in the mind of Mohammed. It is not unlikely, however, that he was hospitable to intimations concerning the life beyond the grave which came to him from various quarters. The curious assertion attributed to him by tradition to the effect that the souls of the martyrs abide in the crops of green birds which inhabit Paradise, is almost certainly a survival from Arabic heathenism, in which

* Koran, 69¹⁹, 25.

† 84⁷, 10.

the departed soul was supposed to take the form of a bird.* On the same evidence (that of tradition) we are warranted in asserting that he took the idea of the punishments of the grave from the Jews at Medina.†

The hypothesis of a future life seems to be a necessity to a faith which will maintain its hold on the justice of God. The inequalities of this life are so marked, the lot of man is here so glaringly apportioned without reference to his deserts, that we must look for another world in which the injustices may be remedied. The perplexity of the Old Testament writers in their attempt to discover God's justice in the assignment of prosperity and calamity in this world, is sufficiently evident from the Book of Job. That they were able to keep their faith in God in spite of the darkness which (to the most of them) hung over the future, is evidence of the intensity of the faith itself. Mohammed never had to go through their struggle. But he felt the force of the moral argument for the future life, if we may judge from the following:‡ “Or do those who do evil think that We will treat them like those who believe and do good, making their life and their death the same? Evil is the opinion they have formed. God has made the heavens and the earth in accordance with justice, and in order that every soul may be recompensed for what it has done, and they shall not be wronged.” The thought is plain; God has a purpose in His

* Kremer, *Herrschende Ideen*, p. 166.

† Bochari, II., p. 93, also p. 24 f.

‡ Koran, 45^{20 f.}

dealings with men. This purpose is the manifestation of His justice. The purpose will be accomplished only when all receive their recompense. It follows from the notorious inequalities of this life that the recompense of the other life is the more certain. It is perhaps with some such thought in mind that Mohammed said:* "the poor Refugees will reach heaven before the rich by forty years at the resurrection."

It is hardly to be supposed that Mohammed worked out the logic of this view. His whole idea came ready formulated from Christianity. The point at which it met his religious needs was this—the Judgment solves the difficulties which force themselves upon us as we contemplate the divine government of the world. The Judgment, then, is the point of departure for the whole eschatology of the Koran. It appears prominently in the earliest Suras. In the *Fatiha*, God is King of the Day of Judgment. The phrase *Day of Judgment* occurs elsewhere in the early period, and is doubtless borrowed from a Christian source.† It reminds us of New Testament usage also, that *the Hour* is made the name of the Judgment.‡

The Koran conception of the Judgment is the dramatic one known to us by the Gospel description.§ The world shall suddenly be visited by great por-

* *Mishcat*, II., p. 507.

† Koran, 51¹², 56⁵⁶. The word *din* here used for *judgment* seems not to have had that sense in Arabic, but to have been borrowed from Hebrew or Aramaic.

‡ 6^{31, 40}, 12¹⁰⁷, 22⁵⁴, etc. Cf. *that day and hour*, Matt. 24³⁶.

§ Matt. 24²⁹⁻³⁶, 25³¹⁻⁴⁶.

tents; the Judge will sit on His throne; all nations shall be gathered before Him; the good shall be placed on His right hand and be welcomed to happiness; the evil shall be placed on the left hand and be consigned to punishment. The picture recurs in all its features in the Koran, except that the Judge is God, and not the Son of Man. In the Gospel, the portents are the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars from heaven, and the sending out of the angels with the trumpet. To this should be added earthquakes, and the various convulsions of nature which the Old Testament prophets associate with the Day of Yahweh. Compare the Koran:

“ When the sun shall be darkened,
And when the stars shall be scattered,
When the mountains shall be removed,
And when the camels shall be uncared for,
When the beasts shall be collected,
And when the seas shall be dried up,
When the souls shall be united,
And the girl buried alive shall be asked
For what crime she was slain ;
When the books shall be opened,
And the heavens shall be folded together,
When the fire shall burn fiercely,
And Paradise shall be brought into view—
Then each soul shall know what it has wrought.” *

The Biblical resemblances of the passage are obvious, and many other passages of similar import might be cited. Quite in accord with the New Testament, is the division of those who are judged into

* Koran, 81:1-14. The meaning is not always certain.

men of the right hand and men of the left hand. We can scarcely doubt that this goes back to the Gospel picture. As already noted, these two divisions comprise all mankind. Those who believe are the men of the right and those who disbelieve are the men of the left.* In one passage there are said to be three divisions. But this is for the purpose of throwing the prophets into relief, they being allowed to go first to their reward. The fundamental distinction is between the good and the bad. Possibly under Persian influence, room was found later for an intermediate class. That the judgment takes place by the help of books of record we have noticed in an earlier lecture, as also that this is based on Jewish or Christian ideas. The use of the Balance to determine the merit of each one is affirmed in some passages,† and this very natural figure has given the theologians trouble, because, in their literalism, they did not see how actions could be weighed.

In order to the complete vindication of divine justice, all responsible beings must be judged. Hence the importance of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The original form of the doctrine seems to have been different. The Old Testament believer was much exercised that the final triumph of Israel should take place without the presence of those who had suffered most for the good cause. In the Book of Daniel, the faith that Israel shall triumph over the Gentiles is accompanied by the faith that many of those who have died without the sight shall be raised to participate in the glory for which they have longed.

* Koran, 90¹⁷ 20, cf. 74⁴¹, 56³ f.

† 23¹⁰⁴ f, 21⁴³.

In mediæval Judaism, the emphasis of the resurrection is laid upon this thought. Saadia, for example, goes into a calculation of the space which would be occupied by Israel when all its dead should be raised.* The earthly kingdom of the Messiah thus precedes the final apportionment of rewards and punishments. For the doctrine in this form, Mohammed had no taste, as is evident from his connecting the resurrection and the Judgment closely together. In his earlier preaching (and perhaps to the close of his life) he thought the Judgment to be near at hand. He regarded it as a Day of Yahweh which should come suddenly upon the nations. His denunciation of calamity upon Mecca was doubtless based upon a *bona fide* expectation of the early appearance of God in Judgment. In this he reminds us of the expectation, so common in New Testament times, that the Lord would soon return for judgment. This expectation is not confined to New Testament times. The most religious (or the most emotional) minds have frequently felt the course of the world to be so bad, that there must be an immediate intervention of divine power. Thus the Fifth Monarchy expectation becomes acute at times when reverses overtake the Church. For Mohammed we may notice :

“ Verily the chastisement of thy Lord is at hand,
 None can turn it away.
 A day when the heavens shall be in commotion,
 And the mountains shall remove!
 Woe, on that day, to those who accuse [the revelation]
 of falsehood!

* *Emunot we-Deot, oder Glaubenslehre und Philosophie von Saad-ja Fajjumi, übersetzt von Fürst (Leipzig, 1845), p. 403.*

These are they who amused themselves with vanity.
 The day on which they are roughly thrust into the fire
 of Gehenna [they shall be told],
 This is the fire whose existence you denied." *

The passage seems to assert categorically both that the day of punishment is near, and that there is no interval between its appearance and the condemnation of the unbelievers. Other assertions that the Day is near can easily be found.† Some of them are guarded in their language. Even these remind us of the New Testament, which is careful to assure us that the exact time is known to God alone. Koran and New Testament agree also in affirming the *suddenness* with which the Hour shall announce itself: "To God belong the secrets of heaven and earth. The matter of the Hour is like a glance of the eye, or even nearer;" "They shall discern nothing but a single cry; it shall come upon them while they are disputing, and they shall not be able to make their testaments or return to their families. A blast shall be blown and men shall hasten from the tombs to their Lord. They shall say: Woe to us! Who has brought us from our resting place? This is what the Compassionate threatened, and the messengers were truthful. There shall come a single cry and all [created things] shall appear before Us. On that day no soul shall be wronged at all, nor shall they be recompensed except for what they have done."‡ Elsewhere also the single blast of the trumpet is followed at once by the resurrection.§ In one passage, however, this

* Koran, 52⁷⁻¹⁴.

† 16⁷⁹, 36^{42, 54}.

† E.g., 75³⁴, 77⁷, 27⁷⁴, 33⁵³.

§ 37¹⁹, 27⁷⁹, 37¹⁹.

is made two blasts: "The trumpet shall be blown and all that are in heaven and earth shall die, except whom God will. Then it shall be blown again and they shall rise and see. And the earth shall shine with the light of its Lord, and the book shall be placed, and the prophets and the witnesses shall be brought and men shall be judged—none shall be wronged.*

It is somewhat difficult to combine in a single picture all the features of Mohammed's description. Besides the sound of the trumpet we have the call of an angel: "On the day when one shall call to something difficult, with looks cast down they shall come forth from the graves like the locusts in clouds."† In their terror they shall flee their nearest friends; the nurse shall forget her charge; the pregnant woman shall miscarry; men shall be drunken with terror.‡ All voices are put to silence, and the only sound heard is the tramp of the millions moving to their doom.§ Angels and men are ranged in ranks. The false gods are judged along with their worshippers. Each tries to excuse himself and to throw the blame upon others. Gehenna is brought near—a flaming monster with fiery maw gaping for prey. ||

Even the animals will be raised and brought into judgment ¶—though this is affirmed in but one passage. Although the books of record are brought, they

* Koran, 39⁶⁸ f.

† 54⁶ f.

‡ 80³³, 22². So in the Day of Yahweh men shall be "drunken but not with wine."

§ 20¹⁰⁷.

|| 89²³ f.

¶ 6³⁸.

are, properly speaking, not necessary. Men shall be recognized by their marks; they shall be compelled to testify against themselves; their members will bear witness against them: "Their hearing and their eyes and their skins shall testify concerning what they were accustomed to do; they will say to their skins: "Why do you testify against us? They will reply: God who causes everything to speak, causes us to speak; it is He who created you at first, and to Him you return; you cannot so conceal yourselves that your ears and eyes and skins will not witness—but you thought that God would not know what you were doing."* This feature appears also in Rabbinical sources. The thought that, as soul and body are both concerned in the sins of this life, both must be punished in the other world, goes back to the Persian religion. †

The multitude of details must not cause us to lose sight of the main point. This is, that the justice of God will be fully vindicated by a universal Judgment for which the dead will be raised. In this form the idea is undoubtedly Christian. This idea forms a motive for faith and good works. Believers are to be rewarded, unbelievers will be punished. This motive is urged by all the religions which have a distinct conception of a future life. As to historical Chris-

* Koran, 41¹⁹⁻²¹, cf. 24²⁴, 36⁶⁵ and Geiger, *l. c.*, p. 74.

† Kohut in *Z. D. M. G.*, XXI. (1867), p. 565 f. The argument that the resurrection of men is no more difficult to God than their creation, is also given by Zoroaster, adopted by the Jews and found in the Koran—Kohut, *l. c.*, p. 578 f.; Saadia, *Emunot* (Fürst), p. 381. The same line of argument is found in the Church Fathers, Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., p. 65.

tianity there can be no doubt on this point, and if we compare Mohammed's descriptions of Paradise and Gehenna with those found in Christian sources we shall not be in doubt as to his dependence upon them. These descriptions are probably the best known portions of the Koran, so that their treatment here may be brief.

Paradise is *the Garden*, or *the Garden of Eden*, or with translation of the word Eden, the *Garden of Pleasure*. This abode of the blessed is watered by perennial streams; the inhabitants repose at their ease in shady bowers; they eat of the most delicious fruits; cups of a delicious beverage but which does not intoxicate, are served to them as often as they desire; they are clothed magnificently and adorned with jewels.

To these delights are added the damsels of Paradise, virgins whose beauty passes description. The delights are not all sensuous. The throne of God is in the midst of the Garden, and the blessed behold the worship of the angels and hear the praises which they sing.* No vain discourse will be uttered, but the universal salutation will be: Peace! They shall receive visits of congratulation from the angels. Better than all, is the consciousness of the favor of God.† That the saved shall behold the face of God seems to be nowhere asserted in the Koran, though tradition affirms it very strongly. It is perhaps

* Koran, 39⁷⁵. It is unnecessary to give references for the other particulars.

† Such seems to be the meaning of 9⁷³.

implied in the Koran phrase: "Those who endure *through desire of the face of their Lord.*" *

On the whole this must be admitted to be a sensuous paradise. Mohammed showed his own weakness in introducing the *Huris* into the picture. For this he had no precedent in the Bible. But for the rest of his description he could plead Jewish and Christian precedent. A recent author calls attention to the description of Eden in the hymns of Ephraem Syrus. This Father speaks of its fragrant fountains, its flowers and crowns; the blessed are served by angels who bring them wine from the vine of Paradise.† John of Damascus describes Paradise in similar terms.‡ That the same features are found in Rabbinical writings is well known.§ It is aside from our present purpose to notice the resemblances further than to show that Mohammed adopted substantially the view of his predecessors. This went so far as to assert seven heavens, and to affirm that the good are rewarded in different degrees, both which propositions may be found in Jewish and Christian authorities. ||

It need scarcely be added that the woes of the

* Koran, 13²². On seeing the face of God cf. Pocock, *Notæ Miscellaneæ*, in his Works, I. (1740), p. 236; *Mishcat*, II., 620.

† Grimme, *Mohammed*, II., p. 161.

‡ Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., p. 154.

§ Weber, *Altsynagogale Theologie*, p. 331.

|| On the seven heavens 2²⁷. The idea is Persian, cf. Z. D. M. G., XXI., p. 562, and Talmudic, *ibid.*, p. 567. That the blessed have different degrees of reward is less distinctly asserted in the Koran though abundantly developed in Tradition, as *Bochari*, III., p. 185. The same idea is found in Christianity (Harnack, *l. c.*, II., p. 66), and in Judaism (Weber, p. 332).

damned are also developed along the lines of Jewish and Christian belief. The fundamental idea is that Gehenna is a place of fire. The name is borrowed with the idea.* The description is frequently given. Sometimes Gehenna is almost an animate monster. Its voracity is such that after it has received all its portion of men and demons and is asked whether it is satisfied, it will reply: Is there anything more? We are reminded of the Biblical proverb which puts Sheol as one of the things insatiable. The unhappy souls are dragged to that abode loaded with chains. As they enter they are greeted with curses and reproaches, which they return upon the heads of those who have preceded them. The fire burns with an intensity sufficient to consume stones, and it completely envelops its victims. It consumes their members, which grow again to be a fresh source of torture. They are given to eat of an infernal tree called Zakkum, "whose fruit is like the heads of devils,"† and when eaten "boils within them like molten metal." They receive to drink boiling water, or a yet more disgusting liquid. Their prayer for relief is in vain. Though continually enduring the pangs of death, death never comes to their relief. Of special punishments we hear only that the misers who have heaped up gold and silver will be branded with red hot coins on forehead and side and back.‡ On the

* *Gehannam*, approaching the Hebrew more nearly than the Christian Syriac.

† Koran, 37⁶³ f, cf. 44⁴³ f.

‡ 9³⁵. The Hadith adds that those who have refused the poor-tax of cattle shall be trampled by the cattle, *Bochari*, II., p. 101.

whole, the description of these torments falls short of the ingenuity of Christian and Rabbinic writers.*

What we have now considered makes up the main view of the Koran. So long as the expectation of an early coming of the Judgment could be entertained, it was sufficient. But the Judgment delayed. Many of the believers were taken away from earth, and many of the enemies of the Prophet were put to death. The question must arise—where are these souls for the present time? Do they simply sleep until the resurrection? The natural answer is that they sleep with the body, and this answer seems to be implied in the assertion that those who are raised will think that they have rested only a brief time in the tomb. In one instance we have the account of a man who was sceptical about the resurrection, whereupon God caused him to die, and after a hundred years revived him. On being asked how long he had remained in that state, he replied: *a day or part of a day.*† So the scoffers, when they are raised at the last day, shall think that they have been in the grave only an hour, or only a little time.‡ The only rational hypothesis to account for this state of mind, is that the souls have passed the time in sleep; and this we suppose to have been Mohammed's original intention. But the impatience of his followers for paradise, and his own impatience for the punishment

* Cf. the *Acts of Thomas* (Walker's Apocryphal Gospels), p. 419 f.; *Antenice Fathers*, VIII., p. 547; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, II., p. 341.

† Koran, 2⁶¹.

‡ 46³⁵, 17⁵⁴, cf. also, 20¹¹³ f., 30⁵⁴ f.

of his enemies, could not rest in the simple hypothesis of sleeping souls. Jewish and Christian tradition came to his help. These, although they asserted a Judgment, found room for a series of scenes to precede the final consummation. For the individual soul, moreover, they had provided an extended experience between death and the resurrection. As these theories became known to Mohammed, he seems to have adopted them more or less completely, but without digesting them into a self-consistent scheme. As further developed by tradition they have all found place in the Moslem eschatology, which thus becomes the complicated thing which we have already contemplated in the extract from Sha'rani. These additional details deserve some attention. They are concerned either with the experiences of the individual soul or with the course of the world's history, and we may conveniently arrange them under these two heads.

Death is the separation of soul and body. It is natural to suppose that it is effected by the angels. Such was the theory of Judaism, going back to Parseeism,* and adopted in popular Christianity.† So we find in the Koran: "If only thou couldst see when the evil-doers are in the pangs of death, while the angels stretch forth their hands [saying]: Give forth your souls! To-day you shall be recompensed by

* In Parseeism the man's good deeds appear to him in the form of a beautiful maiden at his death. Kohut (*Z. D. M. G.*, XXI., p. 564) cites also a passage in which the angels accompany the soul. For Judaism, Weber, p. 324, Saadia (Fürst's Translation), p. 364.

† The *Revelation of Paul* in Walker's translation (*Apocryphal Gospels*), p. 480; *Antenicene Fathers*, VIII., p. 576; Budge, *Book of the Bee*, p. 131.

severe punishment for what you have falsely spoken concerning God,"* and more vividly: "If only thou couldst see when the unbelievers die, how the angels strike their faces and backs [saying]: Taste the punishment of the fire! This is for what your hands have laid up in store." According to tradition, an inquisition is held in the grave as to whether the deceased is a sincere believer. If he turns out to be such, his grave is expanded for him and he is given a view of Paradise. If the reverse be the case, the body is beaten and the grave is contracted so as to press upon the body. These are the *pains of the grave* adopted from Judaism.† The soul remains joined to the body therefore, and is affected by its experiences.

Properly speaking, then, there are three theories discoverable on this point. According to one, the soul sleeps between death and the resurrection. This is implied in the passages already cited, in which the raised think they have been but an hour or a day in the tomb. The second is developed by tradition in the form just noted—that the soul is present with the body receiving a foretaste of its final state. And, thirdly, there are traces of a theory that the souls enter at once upon the enjoyment of heaven or the suffering of hell. The only trace of this in the Koran is in an allusion to Pharaoh and his people, who are said to be brought to the fire morning and evening,

* Koran, 69³, 85² f. The reader who is interested in the theological development of these passages may consult Gautier, *La Perle Précieuse de Ghazâlî* (1877), pp. 9, 15, 16.

† Cf. *Mishcat*, I., pp. 38–43; *Bochari*, II., pp. 84, 92 f.; Weber, *l. c.*, p. 325; Saadia, p. 368.

"and when the Hour shall dawn it shall be said: Take the people of Pharaoh to the severest punishment!"* In the traditions, however, we have frequent assertions that the souls of those who die in the holy war go at once to Paradise. It is not for us to endeavor to reconcile these three propositions. But it is fair to point out that a similar confusion prevails in the Christian treatment of the life which comes immediately after death and before the resurrection.

As remarked above, the Christian theory of the last things embraces more than the final Judgment. When it became evident that the great consummation was not so imminent as Mohammed had supposed, these additional events began to assert themselves, even to Mohammed himself. He was willing at least to allow room for the *signs of the Hour*. Such signs he described in the convulsions of nature which are so frequently mentioned in connection with the Judgment. But later he extended the list. One of the most prominent of the additional signs was the appearance of Gog and Magog: "A curse shall rest on the city we have destroyed. They shall not revive until Gog and Magog shall have free course and they shall come down in crowds from every height."† The explanation is given in another Sura which relates at length the story of Alexander the Great (Dhu-l-Karnain). Among other things, this King is said to have made a wall of iron cemented with molten brass.‡ The object of the wall was to keep

* Koran, 40⁴⁹.

† 21⁹⁵ f. I have substituted the familiar *Gog and Magog* for the Arabic form *Yajuj and Majuj*.

‡ The story fills 18²⁻²⁹, and is derived from a Christian source.

out the ferocious Tartar tribes here called Gog and Magog. It is evident at a glance that we have here an apocalyptic sign which goes back to Ezekiel and which reappears in the New Testament Revelation.* Beyond the assertion that these nations shall come in crowds as a sign of the Day, Mohammed makes no use of them; and in his presentation there seems to be no room for the extended campaign of Gog which is implied in Ezekiel's account.

Another sign of which tradition makes much is the Beast, mentioned once in the Koran: "And when the decree is pronounced upon them, We will bring from the earth a beast which shall say to them that mankind has not kept firm hold of our revelation."† Here is evidently a reminiscence of the Beast of the New Testament Revelation. But Mohammed only alludes to it in connection with the Hour, as one of its signs. The connection is only external. The same may be said of the Second Coming of Jesus, which is once said to be a sign of the approach of the Hour. The coming of Antichrist is certified by tradition only, as it would seem. The expected *Mahdi* who is also predicted in tradition, is another product of the perennial Messianic hope of the Eastern world.‡ Tradition goes counter to the tenor of the Koran when it makes Jesus the

* Ezek. 38 and 39; Rev. 20⁹⁻¹⁰. On the influence which the prediction has had in Christian literature, cf. Bousset, *Der Antichrist* (1895) pp. 29, 33 f. For Judaism, Weber, *l. c.*, p. 369 f.

† Koran, 27⁸⁴; Rev. 13.

‡ An extended discussion of these matters is given by Pocock, *Notæ Miscellanæ*, in his Works (1740) I., p. 213 ff.; cf. also Rüling, *Eschatologie des Islam* (1895).

Judge at the Day of Resurrection. The Bridge on which those who are judged will attempt to pass to heaven, only the believers succeeding, has also a large place in tradition, having been borrowed from Persian sources. These embellishments show how many incongruous elements may be swallowed, and in a sense assimilated, by tradition.

One point remains to be noticed. The eternity of reward and punishment seems distinctly affirmed in the Koran. In fact a distinct polemic is found against the Jews who had the contrary theory: "They say: The fire shall affect us only a limited number of days. Say to them: Have you received an engagement from God such that He will not change, or do you say concerning God what you do not know? Nay! Whoever has deserved evil, and whose sin has encompassed him—these are inhabitants of the Fire, and they remain forever in it. But those who believe and do good, they are inhabitants of the Garden. They remain forever in it." * We are able to trace the Jewish doctrine to which allusion is here made. The importance of the covenant made with Abraham was so great, that the Jewish thinkers could not conceive it to be annulled by any act on the part of man. One who had received circumcision, and who was thus marked as being in covenant with God, could not be punished eternally, no matter how bad he had been. It was recognized by the Rabbis, therefore, that Gehenna was only a purgatory for the Jews, and that when their purification was accomplished they would be set free. It was

* Koran, 27⁴ ff, cf. 3²³.

even said that their sojourn would be only twelve months.* Similar reasoning has led to the theory of the Church that no baptized person can be eternally lost. It is against this theory that Mohammed argues, and yet the theory has appeared among his followers. Tradition makes him say that the people of Paradise will enter Paradise, and the people of Gehenna will enter the fire; then God will bring out whoever has in his heart the weight of a grain of mustard seed of faith. Then they will come out with faces already burnt to a coal and be plunged in the river of life, whereby they will revive as the grain springs up by the side of a river.† In another passage he who is thus delivered is said to be the one who says *there is no God but Allah* and in whose heart is a grain of good. The case seems to be one in which the traditions have invented a doctrine contrary to the express words of the Koran.

One somewhat confused passage should be noticed, lest we seem to ignore some part of Mohammed's doctrine. It is the following: "Between the two is a wall, and on the Arāf are men who recognize all by their marks; and they call to the inhabitants of Paradise: Peace be upon you! They do not enter though desiring to. And when their looks are directed toward the men of the Fire, they say: Our Lord, place us not with the unbelievers!"‡ It is evident

* Weber, *l. c.*, p. 327 ff. It is intimated that an occasional sinner might be found who must be remanded eternally. In that case the distinguishing mark would be effaced.

† *Bochari*, I., pp. 10, 15.

‡ Koran, 7⁴¹.

that we have here no doctrine of purgatory. The most that we can conclude from the passage is that some few will be found whose deserts are so equally balanced that it is impossible to consign them to either place, so they are left perched on the dividing wall. But it is not certain that Mohammed laid any stress on this single passage—which indeed may have been uttered for dramatic effect.

The results of this inquiry may be briefly formulated thus: In regard to the life beyond the grave Mohammed was powerfully influenced by the doctrine of the preceding revealed religions, especially by the doctrine of Christianity. We have no reason to doubt that it appealed to him on its moral and spiritual side—on its moral side because it vindicated the justice of God; on its religious side because it gave promise of satisfaction in the presence of God. The good pleasure of God was one of the joys to which he looked forward. “Do not count those who have been slain in the cause of God as dead—nay! they live with Him, and there they are nourished, rejoicing in what God gives them of His bounty, and receiving the good tidings that those who have not yet attained, but are following after them, shall not suffer fear or grief.”* In view of such expressions and the declarations already noted, that the present life is of no value as compared with the life to come, we cannot doubt the real religious conviction of Mohammed. That, in adopting it, he fitted it to his own taste is only what we find in other religions. The material and the sensuous appealed to him and to his

* Koran, 31st f.

Arabs as it appealed to Jews and Christians of that age. His heaven is not very different from the heaven of Ephraem Syrus nor his hell different in kind from that painted by Dante or Michelangelo. The accretions to his doctrine which came from the Messianic expectations of the Jews or the Chiliastic expectation of the Christians, are due rather to the traditionists than to Mohammed himself.

LECTURE X.

CHURCH AND STATE

WHEN David the Bethlehemite incurred the suspicion of Saul his sovereign, he was in an evil case. He could not depend upon the Israelites to harbor him because they were servants of Saul. The extermination of the priestly clan at Nob showed how perilous it was to fall under the suspicion of the king. David's own clan could not protect him except at the risk of a similar fate. If the fugitive should seek asylum with the neighboring tribes—it was they against whom he had carried arms in times past, and there was no Philistine or Amalekite or Ammonite who would not be glad to take blood revenge upon the unprotected Israelite. The man cut off from the protection of his kin is an outlaw, and his blood is free to the first comer. The only way he can be safe is to gather about him others as desperately situated as himself, to make of them a band of brothers, and to establish their right at the point of the sword. David did this and soon became formidable, was gladly received as a vassal by the Emir of Gath, obtained a town for himself and his men, and grew in strength by carrying war against the Bedawin.

Nor was this all. At the death of Saul the kingdom fell to pieces. The power of Ishbaal was never

more than a shadow. The clans, under the Philistine oppression, lost the feeling of unity and the hope of independence. This was David's opportunity. The Sheikhs of Hebron found the alliance of a captain with six hundred men an advantage if accepted—the danger of rejecting it was equally obvious. It is no wonder that they received him and made him their king. Once the rule of a vigorous man was established, his kingdom could not help growing by the accretion of the fragments into which the kingdom of Saul had broken. The sequel is well known. The power of David extended far beyond the boundaries of Israel, and the impetus was not wholly spent in the reign of Solomon. But when Solomon's rash and ill-advised son came to the throne, the centrifugal force again asserted itself. The tributaries revolted, the northern tribes elected a king of their own, and the house of David was left with only a weak reminder of its former greatness.

This very familiar story illustrates a law which we find exemplified again and again in the history of the East. Its operation may be observed in Middle Arabia even in our own day—for there the tribal society survives in much the same form in which it existed in Israel in the time of the Judges. The unit of society is the clan. Each clan has its own territory which it defends against all comers, while itself ready at any minute to invade the pasture of its neighbors. Within the clan all are brothers. Beyond the clan all are enemies. There is no government in our sense of the word. Every man does that which is right in his own eyes. The Sheikhs have a moral influence only.

The clans enter into association with each other by treaty, but this constitutes simply a larger clan united by the fiction of adoption or artificial brotherhood. Such association does not make a state. But if an enterprising man in one of the clans is able to attach a band of soldiers to his person, government, in our sense of the word, begins. The case of David is a case in point. So is the case of Abimelech of Shechem who established himself as Emir of Israel by means of a band of mercenaries. Having secured the allegiance of his immediate kinsmen, such a chief rapidly extends his power. His power is in fact largely dependent on the ability to content his subjects with the spoil of their enemies. The normal course of such a kingdom is to keep on expanding as long as it is ruled by a capable and energetic prince. But it falls to pieces as rapidly as it was built up, if once a weakling comes to the throne.

This law wrought in favor of Mohammed. But there was a difference between him and an ordinary freebooter. He brought a principle into play which had not earlier had a chance to show its power in Arabia; that principle was religious faith. Had it not been for this, his kingdom would have been no more enduring than the hundreds of little monarchies which all along the course of history have arisen in Arabia and have disappeared leaving no trace behind. In this also there is a resemblance between Islam and the Old Testament history. For the tenacity of the Kingdom of David is no doubt due to the fact that it based itself distinctly on the religion of Yahweh.

These considerations enable us to understand Mo-

hammed's career when he became a ruler of men. In the eighteenth century, great indignation was expressed against him—a man who left his native land to turn his hand against her. He was said thus to have thrown off the mask which he had hitherto worn, and to have discovered his treasonable designs. These charges totally mistake the position. The Arab has no country in the sense in which we use the word. His attachment is solely to his clan. But Mohammed's clan cast him off. They no longer defended him against their allies. He was already an outlaw. The state of war existed between him and the Meccans by their act, not by his. The Meccans understood this. If we may believe tradition, they tried to intercept him and kill him on his journey to Medina. From their own point of view this was the only reasonable thing to do. That they were not more strenuous in the matter is probably to be accounted for by their contempt for him. They supposed the poor fanatic unable to do them harm.

It is probable, moreover, that the Meccans looked upon Medina as a harmless or insignificant city. It was in fact far from formidable. Medina was not a city in our sense of the word. It was simply an oasis over which the inhabitants were scattered in villages. A group of villages occupied the place where the city proper now stands. But it had no common wall for some time after the arrival of Mohammed. Burckhardt* describes the suburbs of the present city as consisting of "large courtyards, with low apart-

* *Travels in Arabia* (1829), p. 326; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, IV., p. 18.

ments built around them on the ground floor, and separated from each other by gardens and plantations. . . . Each Hosh [court] contains thirty or forty families, thus forming so many separate hamlets, which in times of unsettled government are frequently engaged in desperate feuds with each other." Such a loose agglomeration of settlements was the so-called city in the time of Mohammed. Except that they were settled more closely together, its inhabitants differed in nothing from the dwellers in the desert. There was the same lack of government which exists among the Bedawin. The history of the people before the coming of Mohammed is a chronicle of little wars between the clans. Two of these clans had literally exterminated each other, one having been destroyed to the last man, the other having two men left who soon after died without issue. Not long before the coming of Mohammed all the clans had joined on one side or the other in a pitched battle, which ended in the exhaustion of all parties. Even then there was no peace, but war was carried on by isolated murders and assassinations. The community was, in fact, in a state of anarchy.*

Into this anarchy Mohammed came as a fixed point upon which peace could take hold. He was the head of a small band of Meccan converts who had undergone the loss of all things for his sake. These were soon joined by the fugitives of Abyssinia, who were no less devoted to him. His religion had been preached at Medina for more than a year before his coming, and there was a considerable number of sin-

* For a more extended description cf. Wellhausen, IV., p. 27 ff.

cere converts. With this following, it is not strange that Mohammed was recognized as the leading man in the community.

Had he not been a man of character, however, it is doubtful whether he would have become the autocrat that he actually became. One great source of power to a man in his position is the ability to arbitrate between contending parties. A judge who will not take bribes nor regard persons is hard to find. He is prized all the more when he is found. Now Mohammed was honest; he was generally free from bias—so far as an Arab can be free from bias; he claimed divine direction. He naturally became the judge of the community, just as naturally as Moses became the judge of Israel.

Now to the Semitic mind, the king is the judge of the nation. The Old Testament is full of passages to prove this. The description of the ideal king in the Seventy-second Psalm emphasizes this function: "He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with justice." When a man establishes himself as supreme judge of a people, he is well on the way to kingly power. The other function of the king is carrying on war. It is to go out before them against their enemies, that Israel demands a king in the days of Samuel: "We will have a king over us . . . that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles."* This work also fell to Mohammed. The state of war was in Arabia the state of nature. The only way in which the Moslems could sustain themselves was by raids upon their enemies.

* 1 Sam. 8^{10 f.}

In these Mohammed, by his very position, was forced to be the leader. Although he had had no experience in fighting, and although he was not a man of physical courage, yet he was on the whole a successful general. He knew how to maintain discipline, and he knew how to encourage his followers in the face of defeat. As judge and as general he fulfilled the Semitic ideal of kingship. It cannot be wondered at that the kingship came to him.

The course of history then runs a close parallel between Israel and Islam. It is difficult to make out how much Biblical influence was at work in the process. At Mecca we cannot discover that Mohammed had any kingly aspirations. He is careful to disclaim any power over his people; he declares that he seeks no reward from them; he calls himself only a warner and a bringer of tidings; he does not (apparently) adduce the preceding prophets as claiming sovereignty over their people. To all appearance, he expected the government of Mecca to remain in the hands of the Sheikhs, even if the people should accept Islam. A seat in their council as adviser was perhaps the most that he expected. He seems to have known of no Biblical precedent for claiming more. At Medina, however, where the cares of government were forced upon him, he may have had a different light. In this period he tells an Old Testament story that would serve him as precedent. It is as follows:

“Dost thou not know concerning the aristocracy of Israel after the time of Moses, how they said to one of their prophets: Raise us up a king and we will fight in the way of God! He replied: Perchance when you are ordered to

fight, you will refuse. But they said: Why should we not fight in the way of God, when we have been thrust out of our homes and away from our children? Yet, when they were ordered to fight, they turned their backs except a few of them, and God knows the evil-doers. Their prophet said to them: God has sent you Talut as king. They replied: How can the kingdom be his, when we are more worthy of it than he, and he has not received abundance of property! The prophet said: God has chosen him above you, and has increased him in excellence both of mind and body; God gives the kingdom to whom He will, and God is benevolent and wise. The prophet added: A sign of his kingship is that he will bring you the Ark, on which is the Shekina from your Lord, a relic left by the people of Moses and Aaron; angels will bear it—in this is a sign for you if you are believers. And when Talut set out with the troops, he said: God will test you by a stream; whoever drinks of it is none of mine, and he who does not taste it, except by taking up a little in his hand, shall be mine. But all except a few drank. And when he and those who believed had crossed the stream, they said: We have no power against Goliath and his soldiers to-day! But those who were mindful that they must meet God said: How many a small troop has overcome a larger one by the permission of God, for God is on the side of those who are steadfast. And when they went out against Goliath and his soldiers, they said: O Lord, supply us with steadfastness, and make our feet firm, and help us against the unbelievers! So they put them to flight by permission of God, and David killed Goliath, and God gave him the kingdom and wisdom, and taught him what He would.”*

We see that the narrative is a confused reminiscence of the election of Saul, the march of Gideon, and the battle of David with Goliath. The point of interest is the manner in which the incident is made

* Koran 4²⁴⁷⁻²⁵². Saul is named Talut to rhyme with Jalut (Goliath).

to reflect the situation at Medina. The king is demanded in order that the people may fight in the way of God, where we should say *fight in the cause of God*. The phrase is the standing phrase used for the wars of Mohammed against the unbelievers. The prophet in the text expresses the doubt whether the people would be willing to fight. This doubt was a reflection of Mohammed's own experience, for a party of Medinans under an influential leader was always ready to dissuade their fellow-citizens from joining Mohammed's campaigns. The Israelites, in the narrative, complain that they have been thrust out of their homes and away from their children—which was exactly the case with Mohammed and the Fugitives. These features of his own situation, being found in the narrative, make it probable that Mohammed regards himself as the antitype of Saul, or of Saul and David both. We have, therefore, one instance in which Biblical precedent influenced Mohammed's view of his own position as civil ruler. There is another possibly in the verse which speaks of the prophets as warriors: "It never came to pass that a prophet made captives until he had made great slaughter." * But the assertion seems evolved from the situation rather than from any Biblical precedent.

It is rather remarkable that Mohammed makes no use of some Biblical precedents which he would most naturally have cited had he laid emphasis upon this matter of kingship. Moses was prophet and civil ruler; David was prophet and king; so was Solomon. But Mohammed nowhere calls attention to them in

* Koran 8th.

order to justify his own assumption of power. The reason is, that when he published the narratives which deal with these characters, he did not himself expect to become a worldly ruler. We are led to the same conclusion by his not making use of the Messianic idea. The Jews at Medina held the Messianic hope. They taunted their Arab neighbors with the expectation that the Messiah would come and put the power into their hands while reducing the Gentiles to servitude. This expectation influenced the Arabs, so that when they heard of Mohammed, they argued that this was the expected Messiah, and that by adopting him as theirs they could anticipate the Jews and disappoint them of their hopes. But while the Messianic hope had thus an undoubted influence in establishing Mohammed at Medina, we find him making no further use of it. The name or title of Messiah, he connects always with Jesus, the son of Mary.

The growth of the state in Islam was much more rapid than in Israel, but it followed the same course. As we learn from the book of Judges Israel obtained a foothold in Canaan by slow degrees. First a few families would settle upon unoccupied territory. Then they would take possession of part of a town. In this they would naturally have their own quarter, and their relations with the Canaanites would be regulated by a treaty or covenant. So Canaanites and Israelites dwelt together in Shechem in the time of Abimelech. As the Israelites grew stronger they would reduce the Canaanites to the position of clients or "sojourners." Thus, in many towns, the Canaanites

ites paid tribute. A process of amalgamation going on all the time, at last those Canaanites who were most tenacious of their separate custom would be weak enough to be exterminated, as were the Gibeonites by Saul. Precisely such was the history of Islam. Mohammed and his followers first occupied ground given them by the Medinans. They then entered upon a covenant relation with all the tribes of the oasis. Gradually the community of true believers absorbed a considerable part of the older inhabitants. The Jews which refused to amalgamate with the Moslems were driven out or exterminated. But the process which in Israel extended over some centuries occupied in Islam only ten years.

It seems a pity that the development was so rapid. Had it stopped at the stage upon which it entered when Mohammed promulgated his covenant with the inhabitants of Medina, it would have been better for the after world. Copies of that instrument have come down to us.* It is remarkable for the modest position which Mohammed claims for himself in relation to the community at large. He evidently desires to leave the social organization as nearly as possible just as it is. The autonomy of the clans is not disturbed except in certain matters in which common action is necessary. There is no endeavor to enforce uniformity of religion. Even the heathen are allowed to remain peaceably in their old relations. The Jews are continued under the clientage, and of

* It is translated by Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, IV., p. 67 ff. The genuineness seems proved by the fact that it embodies none of the theocratic ideas of the later time.

course under the protection, of the Arabs. The only innovations concern common enmity to the Koreish (of Mecca), common action in *defensive* war, and the bringing of disputes before God and Mohammed for arbitration. Had all parties been willing to live together under this constitution, we should have seen a state arise with some measure of religious toleration.

But unfortunately toleration was not understood at that time. Mohammed valued his document only as the best that could be done under the circumstances. The Jews, on their side, had no higher ideal. They were as far from desiring to live in intimacy with men of another religion as was Mohammed. They had no realizing sense of the danger of their position. They could not keep from giving provocation to their neighbor; and so, when he grew stronger, he crushed them as Saul crushed the Gibeonites, and as David crushed the Jebusites. With their defeat and expulsion, the principle of one religion in the state virtually triumphed.

The principle of Islam is fixed by the experience of Mohammed. What history actually brought forth has become binding precedent and is justified by the theologians. The Moslem has *now* no thought of the state except that it is a theocracy. Its basis is the true religion; its ruler is the spiritual as well as the secular head of the commonwealth. There is no difference between church and state. The church is the state. Instead of a state church, there is a church state. We can make the theory clear to our minds by looking at the Papacy. The actual rise of the

Pope to temporal power was not unlike the rise of Mohammed. The Bishop of Rome was the spiritual head of a spiritual society. So long as the civil power was vigorous, he was nothing more. But when the civil power was broken, then what there was of social order rallied around the only authority that existed. Had he so willed, the Pope himself could not have prevented this process. But we may suppose, without any injurious reflections upon the Pontiff, that he was not unwilling to see his power increase. To him it was increased power to do good, and—so far—a triumph of the kingdom of God. Even the Apostle Paul assumes that if the saints are competent to judge the world, they are competent to decide the petty issues of a civil lawsuit. It was not by violent usurpation therefore that the Pope became civil administrator of Italy. Had the process gone on until the ambition of the ablest Popes was gratified, we should have seen Europe united under a ruler who combined in himself the offices of Emperor and of High Priest. This would have divided the world between a Christian Caliph and a Moslem Pope. The Ultramontane doctrine of the temporal power of the Pope is in fact exactly the Moslem doctrine of the Caliphate.

The name theocracy, we are told, was first invented by Josephus. But it expresses a theory which has been almost universally accepted except among the most barbarous of men. That God is in fact the ruler of men, follows logically from His attributes. It is equally obvious that the man actually appointed by God to rule, rules by divine right. He is God's

representative on the earth. The ancient Persians are said to have seen in their kings incarnations of the Godhead. Divine honors were paid to Roman Emperors. In Israel it was no strange thing to have God say to the reigning monarch: "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." The King of Israel, even Saul, was the Anointed of Yahweh. In the theory of some of the Hebrew writers, at least, the prophetic office brought with it kingly power. Samuel, in the picture drawn of him in one Old Testament document, is the theocratic ruler of the nation—so absolute that he makes and unmakes kings, always, of course, by the divine direction. The conclusion is indeed easily drawn, that if God sends His commands by a messenger, obedience to the messenger is obedience to God. We rather wonder that the conclusion was not more stringently drawn in Israel, and we can easily see that if Elijah, the Tishbite, had called about him those seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, he might easily have seated a prophetic dynasty on the throne of Ahab. It was just because the kingly authority already had a divine sanction that the prophets of Israel did not draw the conclusion which Mohammed, in the absence of a king, was able to draw and to enforce. The Maccabean dynasty is another example of the way in which the religious and the secular power naturally combine in the same hands.

It is the happiness of Christianity that it escaped making any declaration concerning divine right. Its formative period fell in a time when the civil government was taken care of by the Romans. It therefore

necessarily separated Church and State and learned to distinguish between them. The civil ruler is still ordained of God to be a terror to evil-doers. But he is dissociated from the care for religion which the Jews, and after them the Moslems, thought to be a part of the monarch's functions. Mediæval Christianity (we should not forget) took substantially the same position with Jews and Moslems. It failed to apprehend the teaching of the New Testament. The testimony of the New Testament to the divine sanction of the state as a separate entity is only now beginning to be understood in enlightened Europe and America. It is a part of the present misery of the Eastern world that all classes of society are unable to conceive even the possibility of such testimony.

The system which sees in the state a theocracy necessarily regulates religion by law. How Islam came near toleration and how it failed, we have already seen. Islam does not, however, even now, treat Judaism and Christianity as it treats heathenism. The latter must be destroyed because it is false, and because it is disobedience to God. The first consequence is the importance of the sacred war, that is : the war for the spread of Islam. The reason for the emphasis placed upon this, is seen in what has already been said about the fortunes of Medina. It was a matter of life and death there, to make a successful campaign. The Koran of the latter part of Moham-med's life is full of exhortations to take part in the war. Those who may fall in the cause of God are promised the highest place in Paradise. Those who are backward in entering this service are blamed and

denounced for their hypocrisy. It is assumed, finally, that war must go on until all heathenism has been put down. "Say to the unbelievers, that if they make an end [of doing evil] they shall be forgiven. But if they repeat it—the sentence of ancient peoples was carried out! *Then fight them until there is no more division of opinion*, and the religion is wholly Allah's."* Tradition correctly interprets this and similar passages when it says that Mohammed was commanded to make war on men until they should say: there is no God but Allah; or more fully: "I am commanded to make war on men until they shall confess that there is no God but Allah and that Mohammed is His Apostle, shall be steadfast in prayer, and give the legal alms: and when one shall perform these things, his blood and his property shall be secure from me except in conformity with the laws."† The right and duty of propagating Islam by the sword has therefore become fully established as a part of the system. But we should remember that in Mohammed's view, this was against idolaters only. He was content with the submission of Jews and Christians, without conversion. As we have seen, he at first supposed that the three faiths were one in substance, and that their adherents could be welded into one communion. But he was undeceived by the conduct of the Jews of Medina. These adhered to their own peculiar customs with the tenacity which their race has always shown in the matter of their faith. The more Mohammed saw of their exclusiveness, the more clear it became to him that no real union with them was pos-

* Koran 8³⁹ f.† *Mishcat*, I., p. 5, cf. *Bochari*, IV., p. 5.

sible. Under the plea of treachery on their part he expelled them from Medina. But elsewhere in Arabia he was willing that they should remain, on condition of payment of tribute. At Chaibar, for example, he spared their lives and left them in possession of their lands, but on the condition of paying one-half the fruits to the Moslems. This precedent became law for the treatment of Jews and Christians, and is formally sanctioned by this verse of the Koran : " Make war on those who do not believe in God and the Last Day, and who do not prohibit what God and His Apostle have prohibited, and on those of the peoples who have received a Scripture but do not profess the true religion, until they pay a tax for each one and humble themselves." * The terms used leave no doubt that Jews and Christians are meant.

For the extermination of idolaters, Mohammed might have pleaded the precedent of the Book of Joshua. The Book of Joshua makes no formal provision for conversion of the Canaanites. But it is evident, from the example of Rahab, that it was open to the Canaanites to join the Hebrew community if they would. Nor do I find that other parts of the Old Testament take a less rigid position. Idolatry is sin and its devotees must be punished, such is the general tenor of these writings. Their view, indeed, does not generally extend beyond the boundaries of their own land. When the Hebrews were able to bring other nations under tribute, they did so without too curious inquiry into their religion, though in some

* Koran 9²⁹.

instances, at least, the gods of the conquered nations were destroyed.

This need not be developed at length, because the precedents seem to have been unknown to Mohammed. But the general principle on which his rule was based was common to him and other religious leaders. No religion can admit that other religions are as good as itself. The high claims of Christianity to be the one true religion are writ large in the New Testament. To a certain stage of human thought it seems natural, indeed it seems inevitable, that so important a thing as religion should be fostered by the state. If it be the truth, why not make it triumph by the civil power? What Christianity would have done had it been compelled to organize a civil government in the Apostolic age we cannot tell. The Apostles were but men. They had the ideals of their age. It is not unlikely that they would have instituted a state much like that of the Caliphs. We have reason to be thankful that they were not allowed to try the experiment. We know what happened when Christianity actually came to control the throne of the Empire. Justinian required all his subjects to acknowledge the orthodox creed,* and the persecution of heretics is the standing subject of Byzantine annals. Had Mohammed cared to inquire into Christian practice, as illustrated in the Byzantium of his time, he would have found abundant precedent for his course. And at a later day, the Crusaders and the persecutors of the Jews showed the Moslem principle in full force in Christian lands.

* Kattenbusch, *Confessionskunde*, I., p. 377.

The identity of Church and State in Islam involves also this proposition: The Koran is the civil as well as the religious law of all Moslems. As we have seen, there is no distinction of obligation. A man is as much bound to perform the ablution as he is to pay his taxes. In theory the judge is as competent to punish him for neglect of the one as he is to punish him for neglect of the other. In practice it is of course not easy to call men to account for religious dereliction. But in the more strict Mohammedan states, officers are not infrequently appointed whose duty it is to see that all the citizens come to the stated prayers. Now the introduction of a code for Arabia was an almost unmixed blessing. There had been no law in the desert. With the triumph of Islam, the tribes came into the peace of Allah. Society was brought into order, and there was a recognized standard of judgment. But the establishment of any code as a *perpetual* law is a misfortune. Yet Mohammed was only following Biblical precedent. For it is evident that the Pentateuch occupies, for the Jew, just the place taken by the Koran among the Moslems. Were the conservative Jews to be put into possession of Palestine to-morrow, we cannot doubt that they would attempt to restore the Tora to its place as the supreme civil and ecclesiastical law of that land. Every violation of its provisions concerning ritual—sacrifice, lawful food, purifications—would become an offence against the civil law, and would be within the cognizance of the courts. The same theory has prevailed more or less among Christians. The Westminster Assembly of Divines defined it as the duty

of the civil magistrate: "to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship or discipline [be] prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed—for the better effecting whereof he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."* In theory, Protestantism and Mohammedanism stood on the same ground as late as the seventeenth century of our era. Our present condemnation of the position of Islam, shows how far we have advanced in the last two centuries in apprehending the true nature of the New Testament Church.

It may be briefly mentioned here that the recognition of a single supreme code has not prevented divisions among Mohammedans any more than it prevented them among Jews and Christians. The point at which the most bitter conflict arose, was this very one of the divine right of the ruler. Concerning Mohammed himself, of course, there never was any doubt. But he made no provision for a successor. It seems strange to us that he failed to regulate so important a matter. But he was as shortsighted as the rest of us, and did not expect death to come so soon. Possibly he expected to see the Judgment come before his death; or he may have relied on God to give him a long life. The fact remains. The neglect was the more remarkable in that the Prophet left no male

* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, III., p. 653.

children. In the emergency which actually arose, Abu Bekr, one of the earliest and most trusted of the Companions, was made Successor by a vote of acclamation, led by the firm and clear-minded Omar. It is evident that here is a precedent for popular election. On the other hand, Ali, the son-in-law (and adopted son) of Mohammed, seems to have held from the first that the principle of inheritance should obtain. When he himself came to the Caliphate, three distinct parties arose. One held that the throne should go, according to old Arab custom, to the recognized Sheikh of the Koreish (the clan of the Prophet). Another held strictly to the principle of legitimacy, believing that the blood of Mohammed in his descendants (the children of Ali and Fatima) gave the only claim. A third was democratic, demanding an election by the whole body of true believers. It increases our sense of the importance of ideas to see how bitterly the adherents of these three views contended with each other for decades, making a record of bloodshed and suffering which has not been surpassed in the annals of the race.* In this conflict there are traces of Christian ideas among the heterodox sects. They adopted the Messianic hope, and they regarded Ali and his legitimate followers as incarnations of the Godhead. The party which finally triumphed in the Caliphate† adopted substantially Old Testament ground. According to them the ruler

* On this subject cf. Brünnow, *Die Charidschiten* (1884); De Sacy, *Histoire des Druses*, I., p. xxvii.; Kremer, *Geschichte der Herrschenden Ideen des Islam*, p. 409.

† The Shiites, or partisans of Ali, retained possession of Persia.

should be the defender of the faith, and should suppress heresy ; he should judge the people, protect the public peace, punish evil-doers, make war on the infidels, collect and disburse the taxes, and appoint trustworthy and competent officers. These qualifications are much the same which would have been named by an Old Testament prophet. Should the ruler fail in these, the people have a right to depose him—which again reminds us of the Old Testament principle, as illustrated by the freedom with which the elders of Israel assert themselves in the presence of Jeroboam, or the boldness with which Elisha commissions Jehu to depose and succeed the reigning monarch of the Northern Kingdom. But these parallels are the result of similar conditions rather than of direct influence.

The question of government is closely connected with the question of property. Especially where religion is the basis of government, we expect some regulation of property. In any monotheistic religion God is, of course, the ultimate owner of everything, and all human holders get their title from Him. Where the religion emphasizes the brotherhood of believers, we have additional reason to look for some enactment concerning property. In the case of Islam we find, on the whole, a conservative position taken. It has indeed been supposed of late that Mohammed came forward as a social reformer, and that his first preaching urged a state tax to be paid by the rich for the support of the poor. This he tried to enforce (on this theory) by his threat of the Judgment Day. But if what has already been said in these lectures be

true, this theory just inverts the order of ideas. The idea of the Judgment is an idea great enough to enforce itself. Mohammed's mind was impressed with this idea first. With it he had a realizing sense of the sin of men. It was only because sins of property have a large place among the sins of men, that he was impressed by them. Because of their prominence he gives them proportionate attention. He had, of course, great sympathy with the poor, and great indignation at oppression. One of his earliest suras rebukes the wicked in this way: "You do not treat the orphan generously, nor do you incite others to feed the poor, and you devour inheritance with greedy appetite, and you love wealth with an intense love." * Liberality is a virtue, avarice is a sin; these are his axioms, and in adopting them he was no more socialistic than was the Apostle Paul. He takes the differences between men to be part of the divine ordering: "It is He who made you succeed [former generations] in the earth, and has raised some of you above others in rank that He may try you by what He has given you." † The matter of wealth or riches, however, is comparatively unimportant; the present world and its possessions are only fleeting. The real wealth is yonder. In all this he took the religious, and not the socialistic, view.

What roused his indignation was injustice and oppression, and the most of his laws concerning property were directed against these. We find, therefore, stringent injunctions designed to protect the orphan. From the same point of view we understand the pro-

* Koran 89¹⁸ ff.

† 6¹⁶⁵.

hibition of usury. That a man who loaned another money should get back twice as much, seemed to him the use of a false weight and measure. He does not denounce those who have wealth, but those who get it wrongfully. He does not advocate lavish beneficence. He describes the good man as the one who in his expenditure is neither niggardly nor lavish. In all this we discover no social revolution.

That he who has should be ready to help him who has not, is, of course, one of the elementary truths of his religion. But it does not seem that the tax which was assessed upon the well-to-do, was based upon this duty. It was rather a recognition of God's right. It is called a *purification*, and the name would indicate the view taken in the Old Testament—that the property cannot be lawfully used until it is consecrated by giving a portion to God. This portion, like the tithe of Deuteronomy, belonged to God, and, like that, it was given by God to the poor, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow.”* This afterward became among the Moslems a regular state tax which came into the public treasury, just as in the later legislation in Israel the tithe became a regular provision for the support of the priesthood. But Mohammed had no idea of a state treasury, and his tax was intended for the support of the poor. In some cases it was sent to him to distribute; in others he allowed each tribe to assess it upon its own wealthy men and distribute it to its own poor. In the whole arrangement he stands very much upon the ground of early Israel.

* Deut. 14²⁸.

CONCLUSION

IN reviewing what has been said in these lectures we form a tolerably clear conception of the forces which have made Islam. In the first place, we must suppose that Mohammed was a religious nature—capable of appreciating religious truth and of applying it to himself. For religious truth is only adequately apprehended when it is made practical. This does not mean that Mohammed was morally perfect. He was not free from the defects of his age and of his race. He was not incapable of self-deception—possibly not incapable of deceiving others. But he had the religious impulse, and when he came in contact with the truths of Christianity, they burned in his soul. This was the spark which set Arabia on fire.

I have said that it was when he came in contact with the truths of Christianity that his soul was fired. It is commonly supposed that his impulse was Jewish rather than Christian; and his system does, in fact, more nearly resemble Judaism than it resembles Protestant Christianity. But we shall be guilty of an anachronism if we make this comparison. The Christianity with which Mohammed came in contact was the Christianity of Arabia or Mesopotamia in the seventh century. Its type was, no doubt, that of

primitive Ebionism rather than that even of Byzantine orthodoxy. The fact that Mohammed took so large a part of his material from the Old Testament does not disprove this. The Old Testament was a part of the Church's Bible from the first—for a time it was the Church's only Bible. The narratives which we find in the Koran are from that part of the Old Testament which is familiar to every child even among us. They would be equally familiar to the early Christians for the same reason. Adam and Noah and Abraham and Moses are Christian saints quite as distinctly as they are Jewish patriarchs.

And if we find no reason why Mohammed should not take these from a Christian source, we do find things which he could not have got from a Jewish source. His description of the Judgment shows features borrowed from the Gospel account. He recognized Jesus as a prophet and one of the chiefest of them—this could not have come from the Jews, to whom Jesus was the arch traitor, the detested one who hung upon the accursed cross. Putting these two considerations together with some minor indications (all the more weighty because they are indirect) we need have no hesitation in concluding that the impulse came from Christianity.

But, as we have had occasion to remark, the Prophet of Arabia was not able to assimilate the most spiritual part of the Christianity of the New Testament. It was not fairly presented to him, for one thing. What is transferred in religion is not the pure source, but a tradition colored by individual experience. Think of a Roman Catholic missionary—

as sincere, as devout, and as intelligent as you can imagine—think of him as preaching to the Moslems of Baghdad. Does he preach the simple truths of the New Testament, or does he preach those truths in the form in which they exist in his consciousness? You cannot doubt that he will preach a tradition—a tradition in which is much of truth, but a tradition nevertheless. Now think of the Baptist, or Methodist, or Episcopal missionary, is not the same thing true to some degree of each of these? But if this be so in this age of the world, we cannot find it strange that Mohammed received from the humble Christians with whom he came in contact something less and something more than the pure Gospel. On the whole it is rather remarkable that he received so much of the truth. The unity of God; the certainty of judgment; the fact of revelation; God's will to save men; the appropriation of salvation by faith; good works the fruits of faith—these doctrines make up no small part of our religion. And these he adopted and proclaimed. That he presented them in his own form is only what we should expect.

If it is true that not all Christian truths were presented to Mohammed it is also true that he was incapable of assimilating some doctrines even had they been presented to him. The chief of these is the doctrine of the Trinity. In the metaphysical affirmations of the creed of Nicæa concerning substance and person, he would not have been able to find himself. As for the Sonship of Christ, we have already seen that this was coupled in his mind with the conceptions of heathenism; while the idea of a love of God which

could lead to an incarnation would probably have seemed to him fanciful and extravagant. The same is true of the doctrine of the atonement. Sacrifice had to him lost its propitiatory sense—perhaps because it was already a meaningless rite in Arabic heathenism.

Concerning these doctrines, which have so large a part in the Christianity that we know, we are in doubt whether they were ever fairly presented to Mohammed, and we are also in doubt whether he could have used them in his system if they had been so presented. In either case the result is the same. His system is a Judaistic Christianity adapted to Arabic conditions.

But even in this imperfect form we cannot help admiring in Islam the power of the truth. It cannot for a moment be denied that the progress of Islam, which is one of the wonders of history, was due to many causes. It was not the truth alone which triumphed, but the truth in alliance with all worldly and selfish motives. Islam is not the only religion in which the world, the flesh, and the devil have fought on the side of the truth, but for their own ends. Still, when all allowance has been made, we see that the truth in Islam has been a power. As compared with heathenism, Islam is a society in which God and righteousness are living and active forces. Everyone who has been admitted to intimacy with Mohammedans will testify that men are not rare among them who live in the fear of God, who strive to do His will, and whose kindness and benevolence are the outworking of sincere faith in Him. The hold of Is-

lam on its adherents is because it has so much of the truth.

This is the excellence of Islam. It was a great advance on the heathenism which it displaced. We cannot doubt that even now it carries into the heart of Africa a civilization and a morality that are an immense advance on the fetishism in which the degraded negroes welter.

But with its excellence in bringing men one step in advance, we must contrast the tenacity with which it restrains them from taking another. It is like iron in the conservatism with which it holds its system against every attempt at change. Its formalism, its scholasticism, its unchangeable law embodied in a completed code—these shut up its conscientious adherents to mediævalism as their ideal. There can be no real liberty and no real progress where a scholastic system has thus intrenched itself. The position of Christians in the Turkish Empire throws a lurid light upon this truth. Again and again has European pressure, aided by a few educated Turks, endeavored to secure equality before the laws for all subjects of the Sublime Porte. But as often as the attempt is made it proves a failure—each new failure more ghastly than the last. The reason is that the conscience and the faith of the most sincere and upright Moslems are bound up with the Koran and its system. You cannot introduce a reform against the conscience and against the faith of those who must be depended upon to make the reform operative. Before Islam can be reformed, new truth must be brought to bear upon its heart and conscience. Civ-

ilization cannot effect this. Rifles and ironclads, the Café, the Theatre, the written Constitution, Representative Institutions—none of these can reach below the surface. A larger truth, a deeper religious experience, a higher life than the one supplied by their own faith—this must be brought home to the hearts of these believers before they can enter into the larger liberty which we enjoy.

BP
172
S58

Smith, Henry Preserved, 1847-1927.
The Bible and Islam; or, The influence
Old and New Testaments on the religion of
med... by Henry Preserved Smith... London,
Nisbet [c1897]
319p. 19cm, [Ely lectures, 1897]

Bibliographical footnotes.

1. Islam. 2. Christianity and other rel
--Islam. I. Title. II. Seri

A9266

CCSC/els

